Dup Duplicate

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

Winona Seminary

EDITED BY
NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

February, 1907

Education in the District of Columbia 109
The college in the university . . . GEORGE BURTON ADAMS . 121
French influences in English education . . . . . MICHAEL E. SADLER . . . 145
The position of Latin and Greek in American education . . . . . FRANCIS W. KELSEY . . . 162
The Fatherland . . . . . ERNEST LAVISSE 177
Churches and the schools . . . . J. J. FINDLAY 186

Discussions

American university training: a critic criticized, Wm. Addison Hervey, 193—The relation of the college library to the student, William Newnham Carlton, 202

Reviews

Dole's Spirit of democracy, 207—Rosebery's Lord Randolph Churchill, 207—Ross's Foundations of sociology, 208

Notes and News

Limitations of democracy, 212—Limited segregation, 214

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY
RAHWAY, N. J., AND NEW YORK

AGENTS

PARIS: F. ALCAN BERLIN: MAYER & MÜLLER
LONDON: THE AMERICAN SCHOOL AND COLLEGE TEXT-BOOK AGENCY
CHICAGO: A. W. MUMFORD, 378 WABASH AVENUE

(COPYRIGHT, 1907, by EDUCATIONAL REVIEW PUBLISHING CO.)

Entered at the Post-office at Rahway, N. J., as Second-class Matter
Published Monthly except July and August

Vol. 33 No. 2
Whole No. 162

35c. } a Copy $3.00 } a Year
1s. 8d. } 14s. 6d. } (10 Nos.)

THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

—IS THE—

BEST ENCYCLOPEDIA OF EDUCATION

Among the articles to appear in forthcoming issues are:

Types of positive educational reform, by **Professor Edward C. Elliott** of the University of Wisconsin.

A neglected aspect of the American high school, by **Professor Edward L. Thorndike** of Teachers College, Columbia University.

The teaching of medicine, by **Professor L. F. Barker** of Johns Hopkins University.

Early plans for a national university, by **John W. Perrin** of Cleveland, Ohio.

Pragmatism as related to educational theory and practice, by **Professor F. J. E. Woodbridge** of Columbia University.

Syllabuses and examinations in physics, by **Principal Frank Rollins** of the Stuyvesant High School, New York.

Linguistics and Esperanto, by **Thomas Hunter** of Chicago, Ill.

Manuscripts intended for publication should be addressed to The Editor of the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, *Columbia University, New York.*

Correspondence relating to reprints, special editions, advertising, and subscriptions, and all remittances, should be sent to the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, *Columbia University, New York.*

$3 / 14s. 6d. } A Year (10 Nos., none being issued for July or August.) 35c. / 1s. 8d. } A Copy

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW PUBLISHING CO., NEW YORK

Entirely New in Contents and in Form

ROLFE'S NEW SHAKESPEARE

40 Volumes Each, 56 cents

THE popularity of Rolfe's Shakespeare has been extraordinary, and it is to-day the standard annotated edition of Shakespeare for educational purposes.

But since its first appearance several great changes have taken place. Many valuable books of reference relating to Shakespeare and his works have been issued. A somewhat definite method of investigation and study has been developed. This has made it advisable to adjust the notes, introductions, summaries of plots, time analyses, and discussions of characters to the new conditions.

In this new edition the page has been made smaller, to adapt the volumes to pocket use. The notes and the introduction have been carefully revised, and important additions have been made throughout. In the new notes the most important feature is the introduction of Dr. Rolfe's own critical matter, which is drawn from the lectures on Shakespeare that he has been delivering with great success during the last twenty-five years. In spite of repeated requests, only small portions of these lectures have ever been printed heretofore. Each volume is now absolutely complete in itself.

FROM DR. HORACE HOWARD FURNESS

Thanks and ever thanks for this new Shakespeare. I have looked it through with care, and, good as your former edition is, this is, out of all whooping, better. Your notes are all solid, nutritious food, none of your innutritious chaff about texts. This present edition is a delightful exponent of the advance the whole Shakespearian world has taken within the last twenty-five years.

FROM PROFESSOR EDWARD DOWDEN

The Merchant of Venice is admirable in its new form, and with the changes you have made—only I will add that it was also admirable in the old form. I shall see that my students know of the new edition. They know the earlier one well. I need say no word of commendation of a work which all Shakespeare scholars must commend.

Send for circular with full details

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York Cincinnati Chicago Boston

New High School Text-Books

Rhetoric and English Composition

By GEORGE R. CARPENTER, Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition in Columbia University, New York City. 12mo. Cloth. xviii+432 pages. $1.00, net.

This volume is a careful revision, with many changes, corrections, and additions, of Professor Carpenter's well-known "Elements of Rhetoric and English Composition" (first and second high school courses). It contains all the material necessary for secondary school work, in accordance with the best tested and soundest principles of theory and practice.

English Grammar

By GEORGE R. CARPENTER, Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition in Columbia University, New York City. 12mo. Cloth. xv+213 pages. 75 cents, net.

A complete revision of "Principles of English Grammar." The present volume is less difficult, and is adapted to the needs of first year high school pupils. The exercises are full and carefully graded, and the text itself is clear, definite, and suggestive.

Exposition in Classroom Practice

By THEODORE C. MITCHILL, Boys' High School, Brooklyn, and GEORGE R. CARPENTER, Professor of Rhetoric and English Composition in Columbia University, New York City. 12mo. Cloth. ix+373 pages. 70 cents, net.

This book covers in detail all the forms of exposition actually carried on in secondary school work. By the use of an abundance of illustrative material and numerous exercises, a thorough understanding of the various phases of explanation is developed.

First Book in Latin

By ALEXANDER J. INGLIS, Instructor in Latin, Horace Mann High School, and VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, Principal Horace Mann High School, Teachers College. 12mo. Cloth. 301 pages. 60 cents, net.

The sixty-five lessons comprising this book provide an adequate preparation for the reading of Cæsar. Among the important features are the gradual development of the principles of inflection and syntax; the introduction of connected reading, consisting of a simplified form of Cæsar; and conversational lessons based on this reading.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Boston Chicago **64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York** Atlanta San Francisco

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

FEBRUARY, 1907

I

EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

All the hope for good schools in the District of Columbia rests in the Congress of the United States. This hope is strong, for the two recent Acts of June, 1906, tho effecting less progress than was probably intended, did nevertheless accomplish substantial changes for the better. Very much, however, yet remains to do, for the schools are several decades in development behind the best cities of the country.

For two reasons, the hope of progress rests in the Congress. Of these, the first is that the District is a province, entirely dependent upon the Congress and without any self-government. The second is that there is no organized public sentiment in the District for or against school-betterment. Influence is supreme and sole. Influence has torn the schools, limb and heart, and utterly destroyed the school-spirit in the school system and out of it. It is government by influence, tempered only by the social function of criticism by factions, never satisfied, and usually disappointed.

The term school system is used by courtesy. The Acts established two school systems, whose one connecting link, outside the Board of Education, is the Superintendent. But neither set of schools, white or colored, may properly be considered a system. There are, in fact, certain groups of schools under directors and supervising principals; but these groups are not so closely correlated as to form, for either the white or the colored schools, true school systems.

The machinery of administration may be outlined briefly.

1. Three District Commissioners, with sole power over all expenditures, on salaries of five thousand dollars each, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This triumvirate regards itself as the City Council, the City Board of Health, the County Board of Freeholders, the State Legislature, Governor, Mayor, and everything else, except that the Library Trustees and the so-called Board of Education may appoint certain employees, and that the Courts are outside their control. As a matter of fact, however, it is not so regarded by the Congress, for its powers and duties are so closely prescribed that it is but a commission.

2. Specifically, in the matter that concerns this theme, a Board of Education of nine members, three of them women and three of them colored, constituting virtually only a committee of school visitors, appointed by the Supreme Court of the District, but subject to the District Commissioners as to sites, plans, repairs, purchases of every kind, salary adjustments, even in some respects rules and regulations, and without a legal adviser or funds or power to employ such a person; in short, a Board with less power than any other apparently similar Board in America. Commissioners and Courts may review its few decisions, Treasury officers may revise its estimates and do refuse to accept its actual expenditures, and it can not even vote to make purchases. It can appoint teachers; but in actual practise it can not dismiss them. Yet this legally almost powerless Board is held responsible for the successful management of an army of over two thousand employees.

The Board has neither treasurer nor auditor, architect nor business manager, funds nor property: all of these officers are under the direct control of the triumvirate. Yet, in a District, with no other public boards to hold meetings, it is illegal for this body, known as the Board of Education, to discuss any matter whatever save in open session. In consequence, the reporters, hungry for news denied elsewhere, flock to the meetings; with results known in every city in America.

3. A Superintendent who must recommend all candidates. Of this new power here, tho familiar enough elsewhere, there

is no little criticism. Deprived years ago of its proper functions to direct the business affairs of sites, construction, repairs, contracts, purchases, legal transactions, which elsewhere occupy most of the time of Boards of Education, the simulacrum of a Board that was recently legislated out of office, usurped the educational functions of the Superintendent and of teachers; originated nominations by agreed upon alternating processes, listed books, made courses of study, and even undertook to control the appointment of daily substitutes. The new Board has renounced these traditional powers cheerfully; but certain factions, numerous enough in a province where factionalism never finds surcease by victory or defeat at the polls, do not accept the present condition as final or as desirable.

In actual practise, the Superintendent has less power than in any large city of the North or West. He is in reality but a chief of division reporting partly to higher department officers and partly to a special board. There is not enough law on the statute books to make a true superintendent and an effective board of education.

4. A white assistant superintendent, with some special powers under the Superintendent.

5. A colored assistant superintendent, "under the direction of the Superintendent, in sole charge of the colored schools." This creates a surprizing *imperium in imperio*.

6. High school principals, subject in white schools directly to the general Superintendent, but in colored schools directly to the colored assistant superintendent.

7. Supervising principals, with about one hundred teachers each to manage, subject in the white schools to the general Superintendent, but in the colored schools to the colored assistant superintendent.

8. Directors:—of white high school instruction (responsibility for which now rests upon the white assistant superintendent), of intermediate instruction, of primary instruction, of kindergarten instruction, of manual training, of music, of sewing, of cooking, of drawing, and of physical culture, all in white schools; and assistant directors, who, despite their titles, are nevertheless entirely independent of the directors, of

primary instruction, of kindergartens, of music, of cooking, of drawing, of sewing, and of physical culture in the colored schools; but no assistant directors of manual training or of high schools or of intermediate instruction in colored schools.

9. An architectural and consolidation commission of three officers,—the Superintendent of Schools, the Engineer (Army detail) Commissioner of the District, and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury,—to recommend sites, plans, and consolidations (not to the Board of Education, however, but to the Congress direct).

10. A Secretary of the Board of Education, who is a member of the District Supply Committee and intermediates between the Board and the Commissioners. He, and not the Superintendent or the President of the Board, is "the chief executive officer." (The language is that of the rule of the former Board of Education.)

11. Two boards of examiners, each consisting of the Superintendent and two high school heads of departments for the white and colored schools respectively, examine all candidates, and certify the successful ones. Thus they examine those who may, as high school principals, as directors, or as division supervisors, become their official superiors. They can issue certificates, but they can not revoke them. No legal authority is vested in any board to do so.

12. The usual city high and normal school principals.

13. Heads of departments in high schools, whose jurisdiction extends to all teachers of their subjects in white or colored high schools respectively. In other words, in respect to the discipline of these schools by the principals, the schools are distinct; but in respect to their supervision by these heads, all white high schools are one department, all colored, another.

14. The Board of Education must enforce drastic compulsory education, with two attendance officers on salaries of fifty dollars a month, to care for a school attendance of over fifty thousand pupils, ranging thru sixty-four square miles of territory. And the District Commissioners are unable, for want of sufficient funds, to give these officers any assistance by the services of the police.

15. Certain medical inspectors appointed and entirely controlled by the District Commission.

16. The Congress, which fixes every salary exactly, and most of the items of other expenditure.

The revenues consist of the District tax at one dollar and fifty cents upon every hundred dollars, duplicated by the same amount from the National Government; in all, some twelve million dollars annually for all purposes. This low tax upon low valuations makes the District of Columbia a paradise for real estate operators. Of this amount, the schools receive about one-fifth. Exclusive of high and manual training school buildings, the property consists of about one hundred and forty elementary schoolhouses, nearly every one with eight rooms. The Appropriation Bill, past by Congress, June, 1906, makes it necessary that nearly every elementary school shall have all eight grades, and that all the first and second grades shall be half-time. All teachers who begin here, begin in these half-time grades on the lowest salaries. Only three elementary school buildings are provided with general assembly rooms. The Congress appropriates, for the election of graded school buildings of eight rooms each, about sixty thousand dollars per building, with the result that, where land is high, the building must be cheap. There are a few fine buildings, about ten; the rest grade from fair to the worst imaginable. The average condition is so poor that even the worst buildings are endured without protest. These eight-room schools reflect rural America. Most of the instruction in cooking, sewing, manual training is given in rented rooms. Twenty thousand dollars is spent annually in rent for all purposes.

The Board of Education has no hall of administration, and no proper storerooms for supplies. It occupies a small part of the building devoted to the use of some elementary classes and of the white Normal School; but there is not even a door-plate to show where its Superintendent and Secretary have offices.

To any qualified observer of educational systems, three facts must be apparent upon the face of this record:

1. The Congress is attempting to control, by inadequate bureau methods and resources, a really great enterprise. The annual current costs considerably exceed two million dollars, credited to the Board, but solely controlled by the District Commission.

No one knows who owns, or who can legally control the school buildings; but any of the following official persons can tie up proposed expenditure; viz., the Property Clerk of the District, the Board itself, the President or the Secretary of the Board, the District Commissioners, the Auditor of the District, the Auditor of the Treasury, the Controller of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury, any of the four subcommittees of the Congress on District legislation and on appropriations, either House, and the President. Thus, authority and responsibility are lost in endless red tape. It is a quicksand, not even an open sea. One can neither build in it, nor row a boat; without aid, one must drown.

This partly explains why the school conditions here are among the worst in all the cities of America, while at the same time the teachers are among the very best. For part of the rest of the explanation it is well to remember that all teachers are paid the same salaries, which are high for colored teachers but very low for white.

2. The confusion of supervision is incredible, until one knows the facts: here are horizontal supervision, vertical supervision, group supervision, and, as between colored and white schools, unequal supervision. For want of power to administer remedies, standardization and equalization of the schools are impossible. This is true not merely as between white and colored schools, but within each supposed system.

3. There is excessive strain at unprotected points. These may be noted specifically:

(*a*) The two assistant superintendents.

(*b*) The building principals, who must teach the highest classes, as well as manage their buildings.

(*c*) The boards of examiners, composed now of high school heads of departments.

(*d*) The attendance officers.

(*e*) The Board of Education itself.

Coincident with this excessive strain is the slack at certain other points:

(*a*) The supervising principalships.

(*b*) The directorships and their assistants.

(*c*) The class teacherships, generally. These mostly uncertificated teachers can legally expel pupils without reference to any educational officers.

(*d*) The first and second year classes and the kindergartens.

Certain other matters are of importance. These are the schools of the Nation: because this is the political center, because the Nation pays half of the bills, because the Government employees from all the States bring their children here, and because the Congress is the real School Board as it is the real Legislature.

As in all government service, the higher positions are grossly underpaid. A high school principal, with a thousand pupils, receives but two thousand dollars, and the teachers correspondingly less.

The Congress sets aside one session every fortnight for all District business; yet attempts to fix every detail.

A Government that is unwilling to appoint colored persons to the District Commission, or to the District Courts, or to allow the citizens to vote, lest the colored section of this, the largest Negro city population in the world, get a minority representation in the general District Government, permits one-third of its educational board to be colored people; and then denies that Board any effective power.

Incident to a salary increase to teachers, an unsatisfactory Board was recently legislated out of office, and because of Congressional distrust of the Commissioners, the power of appointment was shifted from them to the District Supreme Court. The salary increase added but three per cent. to the budget; the reform has not had time as yet to express itself, and is in great danger of being entirely frustrated. But all expenditures continued, as of old, in the hands of the Commissioners. Incidentally, Congress fixt about seventeen hundred and fifty salaries, of which there were over three

hundred misfits. Out of more than three hundred persons, five or six are now paid more than the organic law prescribes, and the rest are paid less; and there is no present remedy. Incidentally, also, it may be said that the Controller of the Treasury, in interpreting the laws, was constrained to reduce not a few salaries, including that of the new Superintendent, which was reduced by more than five hundred dollars.

The normal schools are merely practise schools, without proper teaching corps and advanced studies. They are among the poorest developed city training schools in the whole country. What they do is good; but it is seriously inadequate.

What are the remedies?

(1) Legal powers for the Board of Education.

(2) A redistribution and a reduction of the amount of money spent upon supervision and special studies.

(3) A redistribution of authority within the teaching corps.

(4) Equal salaries for all grades; and a four-hour primary day, with morning and afternoon sessions.

(5) More attendance officers.

(6) More buildings, larger buildings, and better buildings.

Tentatively, the following changes are suggested:

I. To vest in the Board of Education power: (*a*) to select school sites; (*b*) to employ a school architect; (*c*) to accept or to reject plans for construction and repairs; (*d*) to employ a superintendent of repairs; (*e*) to contract for buildings, repairs, and supplies; (*f*) to hold its own funds as appropriated by the Congress; (*g*) to employ a treasurer and auditor; (*h*) to report direct to the Congress.

Even on the foregoing basis, the District Board of Education would have less power than the city boards of education and of school estimates possess in New York and often elsewhere.

II. To establish a board of associate superintendents of eight persons, at salaries of four thousand dollars each, with the general Superintendent the ninth member and chairman, abolishing all other superintendencies and all the directorships of high, intermediate, primary, and kindergarten instruction.

Over two hundred thousand dollars are spent annually upon supervision excessive in quantity but deficient in quality.

III. To establish fifty group principalships, at twenty-five hundred dollars each, with the unit of not less than twenty-five teachers for each group, to consist of one grammar and two primary schools; abolishing the thirty dollars per session room now paid to eighth grade teachers serving as building principals.

IV. To establish supervisorships at eighteen hundred dollars, for music, drawing, cooking, manual training, sewing and physical culture, greatly reducing the number of special teachers at large for these subjects, but reëmploying them as departmental teachers in the new groups of schools.

V. To establish, in every high school, heads of departments at twenty-four hundred dollars each.

VI. To raise the salaries of high and normal school principals to three thousand dollars.

VII. To establish one board of examiners of five persons, for both white and colored schools,—the secretary to be a qualified teacher, on a salary of three thousand dollars; the others to be nominated annually by the Superintendent, and to receive four hundred dollars for these extra services; and to give this board authority to issue and to revoke certificates, a familiar power in nearly every State in the Union.

VIII. To abolish kindergarten assistants in classes with less than thirty-five pupils.

IX. To employ six attendance officers, and to increase the salary to eighty dollars a month.

X. To open the salary schedule in elementary schools to all day teachers of any grade.

The foregoing can all be done without increasing the cost of the schools beyond the normal per cent. of increase due to growing attendance. But the Congress, in order to accomplish these substantial reforms, must give the Board some measure of freedom from definite prescription. Now, for example, one school has eight teachers and classes, and a larger number of pupils than another school with twelve teachers and classes, but the Board can not take eighth grade teachers from

one building to another, and hence, can not equalize this unfair condition.

In the end, some one must be trusted. Why not trust those who are entrusted by the District Supreme Court with the office of Board member? The judges of this Court are chosen themselves from every section of the country, by the President of the United States. It is, therefore, a local bench only in the sense that it determines local litigation. To their selection of members of the first Board appointed by them, no exception can be taken. It is true that the Board is not of one mind. This would be impossible for two reasons. It is composed of four white men and two white women, two colored men and one colored woman. If half of the persons of this Board were indifferent or weak, there might be some chance of harmony of control by a leader thru a victory, after the struggle of factions; but every member is deeply interested, strong, and able, A better Board, under this Act and with this policy, could hardly be selected in Washington or in any other city. The difficulty is not with the Board, but with its lack of powers.

The city is the political capital, and aspires to be the social capital. It is becoming rapidly to America what Vienna is to Europe. But in strict language it is not a city at all. It is a province characterized by village ideals thrust incongruously into immediate juxtaposition with city conditions, and the whole lit too brilliantly by the sun of the central government. Official Washington from the Capitol to the White House is known to all visitors and readers. Social Washington is the scene of the winter revels of the incoming rich. Political Washington is the victim of real estate speculators and operators. But domestic Washington, above and below Pennsylvania Avenue, the news bureaus, the embassies, and the District Commission, is the real Washington, the greater Washington that is coming to be with its commercial vitality, its earnest local interest, and its intense pride.

Here, then, are the several reasons for cleaning house, for tearing down walls, and for building better,—because every city should aspire to have the best schools in the world. Because Washington is the most prominent city in the New

World. Because it is a city of Government employees, who, tho in some instances they may have renounced ambitions for themselves, nevertheless are all the more solicitous for the advancement of their children, for whom the best schools are essential. Because the population, selected from every quarter of the United States, can and does supply a very superior quality of teachers. And because only a full, rounded, and complete education can deliver the youth of such an overwrought community from the "living body of this death," due to excess of politics and of social functions.

The boys of Washington lack two incentives, felt by all boys out in the States: the presence of economic opportunities and the notion of political preferment. Many so-called Washingtonians vote elsewhere; save at the cost of home ties, the native boy can not aspire to this life. It is a singular atmosphere, wholly provincial, strangely un-American. Official Washington is cosmopolitan; domestic Washington native and naïve. Maryland and Virginia are far away. Massachusetts and Texas are beyond ken.

It may be that the weaknesses and positive ills of the District of Columbia can be cured only by a substantial change in the form of government. Let Americans not be deceived by the beneficiaries of the present régime in Washington and blinded to the profound and general dissatisfaction with this government by commission with the Congress as Council, Board of Education, and Board of Health. And then we shall not be surprized at the popular call for a constitutional convention and the organization of a league for municipal self-government. It may be soon, or it may be late; but it is certain that Washington will reënter American democracy as at least a partly self-governed Federal city. Already may be heard suggestions for two additional commissioners to be elected at large and for a delegate in Congress. Given a property qualification and an educational test for the suffrage, and what self-governed American voter in the States would publicly deny this right of the ballot to his fellow-men in the District? The fight for good schools is but a skirmish in this battle for American institutions at the Capital.

It is a question not of the expediency of the suffrage and of self-government but of the right to the education that comes from the exercise of the ballot and the hope of political honor at the hands of one's fellows. Today there are no two friends in public life in the District. Every man is his own faction. Honor is unknown among the younger men. For a generation, no man has voted. Nothing else can restore honor here than participation in the life of the State, the first of all social and civilizing institutions.

Wanting self-government, the only other solution of the troubles in the schools is to abolish the Board, this last semblance of self-government, this incongruous, anomalous survival of former liberties, and to govern the schools by an Educational Commissioner, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, like the other commissioners.

But the true solution is partial District autonomy.

II

THE COLLEGE IN THE UNIVERSITY[1]

The American college curriculum is an ancient institution. It goes back to a more remote antiquity than any reigning house in Europe and rivals even the shadowy claims of the Philips of France and the Alexanders of Russia to be descended from the kings of Macedon. It was brought to America in the seventeenth century from the English universities. Their course of study was a derivation from the arts course with which the medieval universities began in the thirteenth century. That arts course was the school course of the earlier Middle Ages, and this in turn had been taken over from the Roman schools of the later empire. We need not trace it farther. The great thirteenth century is the turning point from the unprogressive school systems which the classical world had bequeathed to the Middle Ages towards the period of change which created our modern universities.

The intense desire to learn which characterized the awakening mind of western Europe gave rise to the university. It did this by taking the older school as a nucleus and grouping about it new departments of theology, law, and medicine, departments of advanced study, new in methods and new in the material they used. In this way the earliest universities assumed that organization into four departments which has ever since been regarded as typical, an arts course and the three professional schools. In the university of the thirteenth century the relation of the arts course to the other departments was never for a moment in question. No one dreamed of considering it anything more than a preparatory course. Its purpose was to fit the student to go on to the more advanced studies of theology, law, or medicine which formed in medi-

[1] The object of this article is not so much to call attention to problems which I am aware are not new, as to assist in their clearer definition and possible solution by considering them in their historical relation.

eval eyes the real work of the university, and it had no purpose beyond this. It was certainly true then as now that the majority of students who entered on the studies of the arts course never went beyond it. They left the university on completing it, or even before, for various lines of activity in which the educated man had then some opportunity for work. Undoubtedly such students found in the arts studies a general preparation for many callings, but the university did not take their need into account. The object sought in the arts course was to lay a broad foundation on which the special instruction of the advanced faculties might build, and there was nowhere any departure from this object until the close of the Middle Ages.

If the purpose of the arts course remained for centuries unchanged, its make-up did not. Originally it was the *trivium* and *quadrivium* course of the ancient schools. The *trivium*, grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics, taught the Latin language and the elements of logic, and the *quadrivium*, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, carried farther the discipline of mind and the knowledge of tools. This was not a bad preparatory course for the needs of the time, but the needs of the time did not remain stationary. The sum of knowledge, or what those days thought was knowledge, widened steadily, and the higher departments of the university demanded more and more of the entering student. Nor must we leave out of the case the intellectual ambition of the arts faculty, the desire to do more advanced work. At any rate there began almost at once a process of change which we sometimes fondly believe to be the peculiar characteristic of the last half of the nineteenth century, but which is really to be seen in every generation not intellectually stagnant since the beginning of the thirteenth. We may call it a double process of crowding down and out of the arts course the more elementary studies and bringing into their place studies of a more advanced character. It was the *trivium*, the course to which the university in its first steps of organization had attached the B. A. degree, that was chiefly affected by these changes, and from their results came, in the end, our college course. It was in the subject called dialectics that the strongest stimulus to more ad-

vanced work was felt in the age of scholasticism. Room was tion in beginning Latin, that is in the subjects of grammar and rhetoric, out of the *trivium* course. It would be interesting to found for more and higher study of logic by pushing instruc- show, if space allowed, how this fact called into being a new grade of schools, whose purpose was to give the required preparation for what had been originally the most elementary stage of education. At first these schools were frequently within the universities themselves, preparatory departments we should call them in America, and afterwards outside the universities, the Latin schools of the later Middle Ages. The studies offered to arts students in the University of Prague in 1366 will show in a concrete case how far this process had gone by that date. Thirty-three courses in all are enumerated in a catalog of studies of that date. Of these six are courses in grammar and rhetoric, twenty-one in logic and philosophy, and the remaining six in the traditional studies of the *quadrivium*.[2]

But altho the old arts course had been almost wholly transformed by the fifteenth century, and even the grammar and rhetoric which remained had become more advanced studies, the general purpose of the course and its place in the university had not been changed. It was still never regarded as more than a preparatory course, and its faculty was the lowest in rank in the university.

The first age of great changes in university history was that which followed the Renaissance and included the Reformation. The Renaissance, first of all, profoundly affected university life and studies. New methods of learning, a vast new material, new scientific ideals, transformed the arts course and gave it new dignity. Rhetoric disappeared in the modern study of the classics as dialectics had earlier disappeared in philosophy. But changes of this sort were exactly in line with those that had long been taking place, and they did not affect the organization of the university. Practically nothing was left of the old *trivium* course, but even yet the arts course which had grown out of it remained in the university scheme of things the preparatory course, introductory to all higher studies.

[2] Schmid, *Geschichte der Erziehung*, II. i. p. 449.

But the Renaissance made another, and in the final account, a greater change. It brought to the body of arts students and into the actual life of the university a new purpose—the purpose of culture. Cultivation of the spirit for its own sake, and for the advantage which the world at large may gain from it, has its modern beginning in the Humanist. The well-worn grooves of higher university work, he refused to follow. The old professional studies had little interest for him. He looked on life with a new understanding, and the new age opened for him a hundred fields of action where one had been before. The arts course was for him no longer a preparatory course in university work. It was the final stage of education. He did not go beyond it. But it became in á more direct way than it had ever been before a preparatory course for life in general. It might still remain in the formal organization of the university, as it did, the course which laid foundation for later professional study, but it became for a steadily growing body of students the course in which they sought rather the liberalizing of mind, the enrichment of thought, than the acquirement of any special line of science or even of knowledge.

Scarcely had the student begun to view the arts course in this light when the Reformation occurred. With it came two changes in Germany, which were slow in producing their full results but which were in the end revolutionary, and separated the German universities from the common type of university which had till then prevailed in all the countries north of the Alps.

The first of these changes was the disappearance of the college or dormitory system. We now think of the separate college within the university as a peculiarity of Oxford and Cambridge, but it was not so in the Middle Ages. The college was a feature common to university life thruout the north of Europe, and in Germany, as elsewhere, there were regulations requiring students to reside in some college or bursary. In consequence the student body was to a degree withdrawn from the town, and the university had an independent life and an atmosphere of its own which played their part in the education

which it gave. But the ecclesiastical cast of university life of which the college system was a reflection, suffered more from the Reformation in Germany than it did elsewhere. The many avenues of activity and distinction which the new age opened to the educated man led outside the church, and, with the dropping of the rule of celibacy, the university teacher found residence in the college no longer desirable. By degrees the colleges disappeared entirely, and the German university assumed its modern form of a collection of buildings of instruction, laboratories and libraries only, with no natural center of student life outside the hours of formal work. Stated in another form, just at the time when general cultivation as the best all-round preparation for life was becoming a definite object of the arts course, and when, to bestow it most perfectly, the university needed to withdraw the student from the distractions of his own time and bring him under the unimpeded influence of the best the past had done and thought, it deprived itself of the easiest means of securing a life apart and forced the student to spend his days in the unfavorable atmosphere of commercial towns.

The other change, begun in the sixteenth century in Germany, was equally revolutionary, tho its consequences became fully evident only a century ago. In 1543 Duke Maurice of Saxony founded a new type of school. To describe its character and purpose I employ the words of the celebrated historian of German education, Professor Paulsen[3] of Berlin, who says: "Heretofore only individual cities had reformed or newly established their schools; but now the separate German states began to found others not for local needs but for those of the state itself. They were the so-called 'Prince,' or 'Land,' schools whose rise is characteristic of the second period of this age [that is, the period beginning with the fifth decade of the sixteenth century]. The distinctive trait of these schools is that they were state higher schools [Gelehrtenschulen]. Endowed from public resources, from secularized church estates, and placed under public, state and ecclesiastical control, they had for their object to draw the best minds into the service of

[3] Paulsen, *Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts* (second edition), I. p. 290.

church and state. Youth chosen for ability, as well as for need, were provided with instruction and support for about six years, and then sent on to the university, to be supported there also from public means. Upon these scholars rested the duty of entering later the public service if called upon to do so."

The features which made the new foundation epoch-making were the state control of the school, the definite purpose of public service for its graduates when they should have completed their studies in the university, and a higher course of study than was furnished by contemporary schools. The new foundation fell in with a strong desire in many quarters, especially among the Protestant leaders, to improve the character of the Latin schools, and this united strain of influence soon filled Germany with schools having the essential characteristics of the new type. These were the forerunners of the modern gymnasium, tho that name was slow in settling down to its present exclusiveness of meaning.

It is, however, the influence of this movement on the arts course of the university that is here especially to be considered. From the beginning the new school overlapt that course. To quote again from Professor Paulsen:[4] "So far as instruction is concerned these schools held an intermediate place between the city Latin school and the university. Their pupils came to them at an age of from eleven to fifteen years from the Latin schools. They demanded an elementary knowledge of Latin but themselves gave advanced instruction in language and science: Latin, Greek, Hebrew, rhetoric, dialectics, mathematics, and cosmology. A sharp dividing line between their courses of study and that of the arts faculty was not drawn and could not be, because in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the beginning of the arts course was even yet not clearly defined; it still ran deeply into the territory which we consider today as belonging to the school."

In other words the new schools forced themselves in between the Latin schools and the arts course, creating a new field for themselves which encroached on the domain of both the older

[4] *Ibid.* See also pp. 318–321.

institutions. It became speedily evident, however, that the tendency of the new school was to cut more and more deeply into the arts course. Perhaps this was especially true in the little territories which abounded in Germany, too small to maintain a real university but ambitious of that distinction. In such places the school sometimes set up an arts course of its own, and even attached to it the arts degree, possibly adding a professional faculty or two where local talent could be employed. But a more natural influence in this direction was the desire of the teacher to do constantly more advanced work where no clear dividing line warned him off the territory of the university. On the other hand, this tendency of the school was met by an equally strong tendency in the university. The scientific interests of the arts faculty led them in the same direction, and they did not regret to see what seemed to them the less important and more elementary phases of their subject disappear in the schools, leaving them to devote themselves to the higher ranges of learning.

There followed in Germany as a natural result a long period of confusion of ideas and practise regarding these two grades of learned schools, gymnasium and university, which extended thru practically the whole seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. When this period came to an end in the nineteenth century, it was found possible with some adjustment to draw a sharp line between the two institutions, but only by recognizing clearly a revolution which had occurred. The school reaching up to the university had absorbed practically the whole arts course as that existed when the schools of Duke Maurice were founded. It had taken over not merely that preparation in knowledge on which advanced instruction could be based, but all responsibility for that training of the faculties as a definite object, that discipline and maturing of the mind and furnishing of general knowledge by which a broad, rather than a special, foundation is laid for the future, and by which a boy is made ready for the service of his generation in any line of work to which he may be called.[5] On the other side the arts course, or the arts faculty of the university was trans-

[5] See Paulsen, I. p. 267.

formed into something which it had never been in early times, but into which it had been gradually changing during these centuries, and more rapidly at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It came up alongside the three old faculties of theology, law, and medicine, as a new professional faculty—not to train men in a single professional line, like each of them, not professional in form and name, but to give equal specialist-training in the great variety of new activities, which the expanding interests of modern life had created and which may be called in a true sense professional activities. In the government bureaucracy and the service of the state in many directions, in the technical needs of commerce, industry, and transportation, in journalism, in the university and school career, and in numberless other ways modern society demanded the professionally trained man. In giving training of this sort in a great variety of cases not otherwise provided for, the old arts faculty found the field of its new activity.

With the change in the general object of the work of the faculty as a whole, the object sought in each individual classroom changed also. It was no longer the discipline of the student's faculties, the maturing of his judgment, and the enlarging and clarifying of his general knowledge. The purpose of the teacher had now become to impart the special knowledge of a special branch, and the mastery of its methods. The study of the classical authors, for instance, became in the new arts course less an introduction into the literature of the ancient world, as it had distinctly been in the new era opened by the Renaissance, than an introduction into the processes and results of the science of philology. The university teacher found the ideal of his own activity and ambition changed as well. Investigation, the advancement of knowledge and science, the discovery and publication of new results, became the sole criteria by which he judged himself and was judged in the world of scholars, and by which his fitness for promotion was determined. It was even before the results of these changes began to be consciously perceived that the seminary method of instruction was invented, and with it the idea that an essential part of the work of the university was to train the student to

be himself an investigator. This conception of the function of the university and of the professor, once admitted, speedily obtained the whole field to itself. The average man found the temptation to use his position for the more original and more congenial intellectual work, which this certainly was, practically irresistible, and in consequence of the new division of educational work which was taking place between university and gymnasium, there was no reason why he should try to resist it. The German university became thruout, in the arts course as elsewhere, a professional training school, training in the methods and results of specialist work.

Together, however, these two results which we trace to the primary influence of the Reformation, the disappearance of dormitory life and the triumph of professional instruction, have transformed the German university. The duty of imparting general training and cultivation of mind as its main object no longer belongs to it. The community apart from the world, and the closer association with a more ideal life of the earlier university, no longer exist. The university of today is more in the grasp of its own time. Its end is almost wholly immediate and practical, its chief duty to contribute everything possible to the business and professional success of its graduates and to the scientific and material glories of the Fatherland. It can no longer reënforce so easily as once it could man's natural tendencies towards the interests that are more deep and lasting, calmer views of life, and a fairer estimate of the relative worth of things. Not incorrectly does the German student lament the day of his departure from the university as the date when he will be absorbed in the all-prevailing Philistinism against which indeed he has been scarcely at all fortified by his life in the university.

If now we turn to the history of the English universities we find a general result which is quite different. Up to the period of the Reformation there is identity of history in all essential respects with the German universities. There is the same slow crowding of the old arts studies out of the course by the introduction of new subjects, and the same changes under the influence of the Renaissance. When the Reforma-

tion came, however, it left the university and school situation in England practically unchanged.

For one thing there was no attack on the practise of college residence. In England the college system had given rise, in both universities, to noble groups of buildings in which the colleges were housed, as it never had in Germany. In the critical age of danger to the college, the sixteenth century, these buildings had been worthily increased, and they anchored the system in the universities, and defended it even against the suggestion of change. Perhaps it was due to this fact, it certainly aided in the preservation of the system, that the requirement of celibacy of the holders of fellowships and scholarships in the colleges was not removed. In consequence there was no tendency in England for the community life and atmosphere to disappear. On the other hand, there was a special development given to it, it became a pronounced and controlling element of the English university from the fact that each college was, even in the university, a little world by itself. The student found in it practically his whole life and training. The university existed for him only as an idea, or an ideal, and in the most general functions. The group of men formed within the college, with common traditions and associations, merged in a common organic life, was not so large as to divide into fragments from its very size, nor so small as to threaten the absorption of the student into the mass of the university to the loss of his individuality. Defended and supported in these ways this feature of the university life has survived even the unfriendly tendencies of the nineteenth century, and forms still one of the chief characteristics of Oxford and Cambridge.

In the second place there was in England no system of schools, founded and controlled by the state, having a purpose not wholly in sympathy with the university and standing in no definite relation to its course of study, to encroach upon the field of the higher institution. Modern investigation has largely deprived Edward VI. of the credit which tradition once gave him as the founder of grammar schools, and the grammar school where it existed in England, or was established in scanty numbers, had no such object before it, and cherished

no such ambitions, as the German gymnasium. Nothing of the same character came into existence in any form. On the contrary, the need of elementary instruction, as preparatory to that of the university, was met by the rise of great public schools, private schools as they would be called in America, founded and endowed by individuals, for the distinct purpose of preparing for the old arts course of the university under a control in full sympathy with this object. The effect of the Renaissance was still unfelt in England when Winchester was founded, and it is not necessary even to mention by name the illustrious foundations of the same kind which followed.

For the preservation in the universities of an ideal of general training and of a course of study consciously directed towards a broad and liberal preparation for life, it was of decisive value that the field of lower education was occupied by schools of this type before the divergent tendencies felt in Germany came into existence. It was indeed very likely due to this fact that these tendencies were never felt in England. We may go even further than this and say that these English public schools became preparatory to the universities not merely in classics and mathematics, but in this particular of organic life as well. The student came up to the university already with that openness of mind and with those quickened sympathies which are gained less easily from the study of books than from life in the midst of fine associations, and under the influence of venerable traditions. The stamp of Eton and Rugby is indeed scarcely concealed by the later stamp of the university, but certainly that which distinguishes in the eyes of the world the Oxford or Cambridge man, and which has been in English public, literary, and private life a constant enrichment of the national forces, has been made by these schools far easier of acquirement.

As compared with German education this different result means that in England the ideals and conditions of the arts course of the Middle Ages survived. In what is actually taught there has been a complete change, and the Oxford arts course of today is not more like that of the year 1500 than is Berlin's. But no purpose of professional training has taken

possession of it, no ideal of specialist instruction as its chief end, or belief that the best training for every student is that by which the scholar must be made. The ideal which has remained is that of faculties trained for future work in any direction, particularly in public service, and of wide and hospitable culture.

If we inquire what it is in English university education which has made this contribution to the life of the nation possible we are inevitably led to the conclusion that it is not the content of the course of study. That has greatly changed from time to time. It is the surroundings in the midst of which studies are pursued. It is the life of the university, held free from any strong influence from without, the sum total of that which we may call in the highest sense the social environment, the spirit and ideals of the place. This life the colleges have cherished, and without them, and with a wholly practical purpose of education, it would long ago have disappeared.

It was this arts course of the English universities, not in its developed modern form but as it stood in the seventeenth century, that was brought over to America as the curriculum of the American college. Nor was ours then as advanced a curriculum as the English model. The scanty resources of the colonies could not compass that, nor did their needs demand it. But in general character, in spirit and in purpose, it was the English arts course which the American college copied. Hardly had the American college begun, however, before the old process began here also, which had characterized university history from the thirteenth century—the process of advancing the curriculum by crowding down and out more elementary studies to make way for the more advanced. Harvard began with a college course of three years, but was shortly able to make it four. If we could follow the detailed history of the curriculum it would be easy to see how this process runs thru the whole eighteenth, as thru the whole nineteenth century. The study of mathematics must suffice as a concrete case. A letter of Jonathan Edwards written in 1719 shows that in the next year, his senior year in Yale College, he was to begin the study of geometry.[6] In 1726, accord-

[6] Dwight, *Life of Edwards*, p. 32.

ing to the college laws, geometry was a study of the senior year. In 1743 President Clap, in a general statement about the college curriculum, mentions geometry as a study of the sophomore year—an improvement of the course of study as rapid as anything the nineteenth century can show. Geometry remained in the sophomore year at Yale until 1825, when it came down to the third term of freshman year, and thirty years later it began to be demanded for admission to college.

The same change might be traced in other studies. The theological cast with which the New England college began had largely disappeared by the beginning of the nineteenth century. The real study of Greek entered the curriculum about the same time, and the modern study of science also. The introduction of the elective system in the last quarter of the nineteenth century was only a device for carrying on more rapidly and spreading over a wider territory a process which had been going on in our colleges for two hundred years. In turn the effect of these changes on the lower schools was the same as in medieval Europe. To the end of the eighteenth century there was hardly such a thing as a preparatory school. The candidate for college picked from the general Academy course such things as he needed, or he obtained private instruction, and the bright boy easily got himself ready for the ordeals of college entrance in two years. Daniel Webster prepared in one year and a half from his beginning of Latin. In 1808 Phillips Exeter Academy took the first steps towards the definite organization of the course of study and in 1818 a great change was made. The separation of the classical college preparatory course from the English was then made complete, and it became definitely a three-years' course. This it remained unchanged in form until 1872, when the advances which had already been made in the colleges forced the schools to make their preparatory course one of four years. It will be noticed that the more radical changes in the college curriculum had hardly begun when this change to a four-years' course was made by the schools.

In the meantime the middle decades of the nineteenth century saw the beginning of two movements in the field of higher

education which have created the most characteristic features of the present situation and the most serious problems of the future. The first of these is the rise of the city high school. The natural development of our public-school system and the large part which the town plays in present-day life have given the high school an importance and an office in the community hardly dreamed of by those who labored at its beginning. From no point of view can this be a source of regret. The good which these schools are doing, and which they are to do in still larger measure, is so great as to outweigh any temporary inconvenience which they may create by a failure to harmonize exactly with existing institutions. But in this article I am concerned with the problem which their growth presents to those who are interested in the future of the college.

From such a point of view there are two things to be considered. In the first place the character given to the high school by its situation. It is a municipal institution, municipal in control and municipal in life. Public authority, in the end the state, determines its character and directs its growth for its own purpose, always in the main the immediate practical purpose. More important for the present comparison is the fact that the city high school must remain a day school. It can have no dormitory system. It can have no sort of physical, or even sentimental boundaries, which hold its life apart from the ordinary life of the town in which it is placed. Its pupils must remain for the most part wholly in that life from which they are withdrawn for a few hours only each day, to be brought into other, but always somewhat artificial relations. In its own purposes and in the atmosphere which surrounds it, the practical must always outweigh the ideal. It is bound to the past by no tradition either to mark out the limits of innovation, or to enrich its influence with inherited associations. It can have no esthetic effect peculiar to itself, no "academic calm," no architectural impressiveness, hardly even the impressiveness of a great group of buildings which form the natural home of the school. In a word the high school can never hope to exert over its pupils the influence of the English college.

A second characteristic of the high school, more significant

still in its bearing on the future, is the fact that its primary object is to furnish an education complete in itself. It is not a preparatory school. It stands in no relation to any higher institution which exerts a controlling influence over the character and extent of its work, not even as yet where the state university exists as the culmination of the public school system.[7] Its aim to give to the great majority of its pupils a final education—the best possible in existing conditions. It follows from this fact, as well as from the history of the high school, that it has no predestined course of study, clearly defined along its upper borders. It is itself ambitious, in its place it is its duty, to furnish the highest available education to those who can go no farther. Under this impulse it has reached forward into the old field of the college. How far this has gone, or how far it is planned that it may go, can easily be seen by turning over a few volumes of the *School review*, published at the University of Chicago. To take an example in Volume XII. (1904): Beginning on page 15 will be found an account of the "seventeenth educational conference of the academies and high schools affiliating or coöperating with the University of Chicago." This conference had before it for discussion a "problem," submitted at the last previous conference, and investigated in the meantime by three committees, each of seven members, and each looking at the subject from a different point of view. The second suggestion of this problem was as follows:

To extend the work of the secondary school to include the first two years of college work.

The reports of the committees were all in favor of the adoption of the plan proposed. That of the committee regarding the matter from the side of the high school said: "This question is not something 'dug up' to be settled, but something 'grown up' demanding settlement. Forty years ago there was scarcely one high school in the country whose work could compare with that of a second- or third-rate high school of today. 'Go forward' has been the watchword acted upon, if not announced, and the end is not yet. All over this state [Illinois] you may

[7] See J. F. Brown in the *School review*, xii. (1904), pp. 299–307.

find, if you investigate, that within the past five years high schools offering two-years' work have increased that work to three: those offering four-years' work have increased the work to five or six years. These movements have gone on, are going on, without any blare of trumpets or any precursors to make any announcement." And again: "The work set forth enables the student completing the six-years' work to enter any professional school, such as law, medicine, dentistry, engineering, theology, etc., and also to enter upon pure university work at once, and without delay while he completes something he began in the lower school."

This problem formed also the subject of discussion in the eighteenth conference, in November, 1904, which is reported in the *School review* for January, 1905, where will also be found an interesting account of the six-years' course in operation in the high school of Goshen, Indiana.

It is hardly necessary to expend words to point out the parallel which exists between the situation created for us by this relation of the high school to the college and that existing in Germany of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with the gymnasium growing up beside the old arts course. We have now, as Germany then had, a school under public authority, intrenched in the community life, ambitious to annex as much as possible of the old arts course, placed under no responsibility to the university, and held off the field of the arts course by no boundary line, and, it may be added, affording an easy refuge for the old arts studies pushed out of the college by an advancing standard. It should be equally evident that the efforts of the public schools are met halfway by those professional schools which for whatever reason stand ready to accept the high school graduate as meeting their requirements of admission. Nor has it any bearing on our problem to point out the fact that this relation between the lower and professional school is highly satisfactory in the situation which exists in Germany, for the arts course, whose existence is in question here, disappeared in that country practically three generations ago. There is no more reason why the law department of the German university should not accept the student who comes up

from the gymnasium, than why the philosophical department should not.

In the meantime, during the same years that brought the high school to its present position, a movement was taking place in the university world which fills out the parallel with fatal completeness. I mean the rise of a new department in the university—the so-called graduate, or post-graduate school. A variety of causes combined together to lead to the beginning of graduate instruction, which merely means that it answered a real demand. The desire of the college professor trained in Germany and ambitious to advance the bounds of knowledge in his own specialty, to gather about him a group of students for whom he could do what had been done for him in the foreign country, whom he could make scholars in the true sense, was no doubt an important factor in the new departure. This motive, however, could have accomplished nothing if there had not been at the same time enlarging opportunities for scientifically trained men in many lines of professional or semi-professional work. The advance was especially aided by the growth of a larger demand, in the smaller colleges and in secondary schools, for teachers able to give instruction from the solid ground of scientific knowledge, than could be supplied from men trained in Germany.

Stated in its simplest terms, the rise of the graduate school was the introduction into the American university of the new German arts course in addition to the old English arts course previously existing here. The combination produced a result new in the history of higher education. Previous to the beginning of this movement, say at the middle of the nineteenth century, the American university, at least in its oldest and most largely attended examples, corresponded almost exactly to the type of university prevailing in Europe thru nearly the whole of university history—the preparatory arts course, and the three professional faculties of theology, law, and medicine. Early American conditions had given to the arts course a relative importance in the university which it had never possest in Europe and which does not logically belong to it, but this fact does not materially alter the parallel and it did not

change the purpose of the course. Now without modifying this constitution there was added a fourth professional school, carrying forward the studies of the arts course by technical methods for technical purposes.

This gives us a university organization which, tho it may be new, should be as easily understood as it is scientifically correct and defensible at every point. It would seem also to give us an institution in which the component parts, college and university, old and new arts course, are sharply enough distinguished in field and purpose to permit of their coördinate and harmonious development in the future.[8] But it is perhaps not strange that these developments, new as they were, and occurring in an age of universal change and of free theoretical experiment in education, have had as their accompaniment some confusion of thought and practise.

To this fact almost alone we must attribute, I think, the invasion of the college course by the studies of the graduate department, of the old arts course by the new, which has gone so far in the last twenty-five years. It is easy to see how such an invasion occurred. The introduction into the college curriculum of the elective system on a large scale opened an easy way for the graduate studies into the upper years of the college. At the same time the problem of economy, economy of time as well as of money, was forced to the front with an im-

[8] There is a suggestion of the advantage afforded us by the existence together of these distinct arts courses in the same institution in the differing contentions of the recent inaugural lectures of Professors Firth and Oman on taking the two chairs of History at Oxford. In spite of their conflict of opinion, both are in the main right. Professor Firth is right in saying that it is the proper function of the university to train the historical investigator. Professor Oman is right in saying that it is equally the function of the university to give a general education in history to the great mass of students who will never become investigators, and that, if but one of the two things can be done, this is probably the more useful work. Professor Firth is right in thinking that without instruction the historical investigator learns his art with difficulty, and that many who might have been fruitful scholars never learn it at all. Professor Oman is right in asserting that, if the Oxford history curriculum is modified to accomplish the ends desired by Professor Firth, its value and attractiveness for the average undergraduate will be destroyed, and but few will study history. This is the dilemma presented by the single arts course in the university. This is the problem which our two arts courses enable us to solve without the slightest difficulty, if we recognize their separate spheres and keep them distinct.

perative demand for solution by the rapid spread of the elective system. For the moment it seemed to be solved by uniting in a single classroom graduates and undergraduates in a great variety of courses. From the side of the graduate school, growing with leaps and bounds at the same time with the broadening of the elective system, this expedient was welcome, because the university could provide few independent graduate professors. The work of the school, if it were to be done at all, must be done by the already heavily burdened undergraduate instructors. To many college teachers such a union of work seemed not only unobjectionable, but even desirable, for two reasons. In the first place it gave full scope to the natural inclination of the trained specialist to make his instruction as highly scientific as possible. Most of all things he wishes to avoid the seeming weakness of popularizing and diluting his share of organized knowledge for the benefit of the man who does not care to acquire a scientific command of it, but is merely seeking to get its intellectual meaning and its point of view. In the second place almost every instructor, in the days when this process began, was trained in Germany. Identifying in his mind, as he was apt to do, the American arts course with the German, he felt that he was doing the right thing, it seemed almost a duty, to transform as far as possible the work of the American college into the kind which he had known in Germany. Under these combined influences and almost imperceptibly, this process—really a process of combining into one these two different arts courses—has gone on, to some extent in all universities, and to a great extent in a few.

That this process is properly to be called an invasion, that before it indeed all defenses are thrown down and the way opened for the operation of the most effective causes by which the old arts course was destroyed in the German universities, hardly needs to be proved. That the studies of the graduate department are to be considered in their real character professional studies is clear. That they are, in the great majority of cases, antagonistic to the tone and purpose which should prevail in the college, that they seek to give the acquirements and outlook of the specialist, and not a general cultivation, a

special and not a general preparation, must be evident from any careful examination of the case. Either this is so, or the studies of that department fail of performing their office in the university and degenerate—the language is proper in their case —into mere culture studies. It follows that to give up any large portion of the college course to these studies is to abandon it to professional work. To train in the same classroom and by the same method the future scholar and specialist and the future business man or man of the world is to force the college student into an air and environment which, so far as they go, are hostile to the college life, or else it is to do the graduate student a wrong, and this is a wrong which a university faculty is not likely to commit.

But this attack upon the college from above has been accompanied by another, in one particular more serious. The professional schools of the original universities have shared the general impulse to advance, and during the same period they have added a year, or in some cases two years, to their course of study. The result was, and is in institutions where no compensating changes have been made, a course of study, from the beginning of preparation for college to graduation into professional work, of from eleven to twelve years. No sooner had this been realized in practise than it led to many complaints, and pressure, increasing pressure for a time, for a reduction in the length of this course of study. It was natural that this demand should center on that portion of the course of study which had the least practical character, which could be shortened with the least apparent and immediate loss, the traditional college course.

This demand for reduction of time has taken two chief forms. First, the demand that the college course should be formally and by official act for all students cut down to three years. This drastic measure has indeed, up to the present time, appeared more frequently in argument than in practise, except in the indirect method of making it somewhat easier than formerly for the student to do in three years a maximum of work required of all who graduate, and reckoned for most students as four years' work. A three-years' college

course is in reality, however, the more logical form which the demand should take, but the fact is hardly recognized in the discussion that, as regards one side of the changes of the last forty years, this proposal is at least a partial confession of failure. Nor is the fact observed that, if it were carried into effect, it would entail an actual loss as compared with the result which we should by this time enjoy if the process of pushing the earlier studies of the college down into the secondary school had not been carried quite so far. Applied to the present situation the proposed plan would give us a course of study of seven years, to the B. A. degree, exactly as fifty years ago; but four of these would now be taken in school and only three under the conditions of college life. The college course for the three years left to it would indeed still remain a greatly enriched curriculum of studies as compared with the earlier time. It would be impossible to justify, or even to argue for a return to the earlier curriculum, or to the earlier standard of entrance requirements. But it needs no argument to show that the proposed three-years' course, if adopted, would mean, to a certain extent, an undoing of the work so actively carried forward in the last half-century. It would mean that the year of more advanced study which has been, during this time, added to the college course is bodily dropt out, for it would be in all cases the eighth year which would be given up, and that while an extra year is taken in the schools, under better conditions than formerly, the student is brought during only three years under the more potent and permanent influences of college life. If we regard the purpose of the college as not properly the production of scholars but the giving of a broad, general training to all, it would certainly be preferable if the year lost to the schools could be recovered from them, and their course be left one of three years, rather than to cut down the college course.

The second direction which the demand for a shortened course of study has taken is that the members of a college class who wish to do so should be allowed to use the fourth year of their college course for professional studies, or that the last year of the course should be made for them identical with the first of the professional school. It is in this direction up to

the present time that experiments have been more commonly made in shortening the college course. They have been of considerable variety, and need not be here described in detail, since they all have practically the same result with perhaps a single exception. They all permit the student, sooner or later, and under varying conditions, to drop his college studies and devote himself to his professional preparation.

I have called, and rightly, this movement of the graduate departments against the college an invasion, and the spirit natural to the graduate school in principle hostile to the spirit, somewhat ideal and unpractical, which should prevail in college. But to state the case with entire accuracy requires a slight limitation of these absolute assertions. Professional studies, or those which may from one point of view be so considered, have always formed a part of the college curriculum. This was particularly true of theological studies in the eighteenth century. The improvement of the character of the curriculum, which accompanied the general broadening of American life, gradually crowded out many of these studies even before the beginning of the nineteenth century, but this process of improvement, especially as carried farther in the last hundred years, has introduced other studies standing in a similar relation to other professions. Chemistry, biology, jurisprudence and international law, may serve as examples of relationship with the traditional professions, and if we were to include the new lines of work which are virtually professional we should find that a complete list of such studies would be long. But all these things together have not modified in any essential degree the character of our college education.

It is evident, however, that all the studies just mentioned possess, either in themselves or in their surroundings as they stand in the curriculum, certain characteristics which render them helpful, or at least not antagonistic, to the purpose of the college course. All of them have an elementary and introductory character, or a general, apart from their professional application, which renders them properly a part of the furnishing of an educated man. If this is not the case in some instances, like some advanced scientific studies, then

they are taken by so few students, and are likely always to be taken by so few, that their effect is inappreciable. These studies have also never been found in the past grouped together in any one portion of the curriculum giving it a technical and specialist character, but have been so scattered thru it all as to be practically absorbed in the character of the work as a whole. If these characteristics and surroundings can be preserved, their introductory and general character, and their absorption in a whole which gets its tone from other sources, then professional studies can be admitted in considerable extent to the college curriculum with no change in its real character or effect. It seems indeed as true of the American college as of the English that the best results have been produced not so much by any particular studies, as by the ideals of the place and by the social environment in which the student lives.

It is as true of the studies of the graduate school as it is of law or medicine—that they may be taken into the college course with no appreciable tendency to destroy its character, if they are so limited in number and situation that they are themselves readily absorbed, or if they are of a kind which will attract few undergraduate students. Indeed it is highly desirable that they should be. Every student, somewhere in his college course, in as many subjects as possible under the limitations indicated, should be given an understanding of the scholar's way of doing things and of looking at things, merely as a part of his general education, if for no other reason. As college chemistry and physics should, and in the majority of cases do, give to the student who does not pursue them farther an understanding of the nature of scientific evidence, and of the processes by which science reaches its results, so something of the same kind may wisely be done, it perhaps especially needs to be done, in those studies which may most easily be made the channels of higher culture—literature and history. But if the college course is so largely abandoned to graduate and professional studies that it is made impossible for the student in his later years, say in his fourth year, to find satisfactory studies not specialist in character, he will cease to

regard that year as other than professional, and it is probable that in time few will see in it any inducement to remain in college. It is a condition of this kind which in some of our universities seems to be rapidly approaching.

Let me conclude this historical sketch with a summary and application. Our earliest history gave us the American college—the medieval arts course, standing alone, as that had been recast in England and emphasizing as strongly as in England, more strongly, perhaps, the purpose of that course, to give not special but general training. In the second stage of our history we gathered about this arts course the traditional professional schools and so reproduced the medieval university. Later we introduced into the university the graduate school, giving us two arts courses, the old medieval of general preparation and the new German of technical study. But we did not hold the new course sharply by itself as a new professional department. We confused it in our minds with the old arts course, and let it cut deeply into that territory. At the same time the old professional schools advanced the standard of their work and began to demand loudly that they too be allowed a portion of the arts course. But this attack from above coincided with an attack from below. The high school, bound by no traditional allegiance and led by new ambitions, cut as deeply into the lower years of the college course. Both these lines of attack are still vigorously prest, and the outcome of the conflict is not yet apparent.

The development of higher education on this continent has given us a result unique in organization and offering, it would seem, unequaled advantages. To the traditional university, retaining the preparatory arts course in the midst of the professional schools, we have added another arts course, as different in method and purpose as it is in historical origin. Could there have been devised any better beginning from which we might hope to gain the peculiar excellencies of both English and German education, or from which to strive to avoid their peculiar defects?

George Burton Adams

Yale University

III

FRENCH INFLUENCES IN ENGLISH EDUCATION[1]

England, whose geographical position makes her accessible and yet keeps her separate, has always lain open to a stream of intellectual and social influences from other lands. It is characteristic of her that she has remained thruout intensely national in spirit, but in many of her changing moods she has shown herself very susceptible to ideas from abroad. Thus, English thought and institutions have gained at different times fresh vigor from Italy, from Germany, from the Netherlands, and from America. But no other foreign influence has been so persistent and long-sustained, so clarifying and at times so full of challenge to our many-mindedness as the influence of France. And the task with which I am charged this afternoon is that of reminding this distinguished assembly of the debt which English education owes to French thinkers and to French example.

To France, the English universities of the Middle Ages were indebted for much of their constitutional form and for much of their intellectual tradition. The Vice-Chancellor has reminded us that the rise of the older Oxford schools to the position of a *studium generale* may have been due to a migration of students from the University of Paris about 1167, and that the great dispersion of the masters and scholars from Paris in 1229 may have been the chief factor in the early development of the University of Cambridge. However this may be, the University of Paris drew to itself for many generations the thoughts of every aspiring young scholar in England. As Ramus said of it in later years, it was the university not of one city only but of the entire world. Side by side with the Papacy and the Empire, it stood as one of the three great institutions

[1]An address delivered on June 5, 1906, at London University. Reprinted from *Modern language teaching*, October, 1906.

of medieval Christendom. One of the four nations into which its faculty of arts was divided, bore the name of the English, and tho the latter shared their membership with Germans and other students from northern Europe, the fact that they gave their name to it shows their numerical importance in this great division of university life.

We have some Latin elegiacs, written about 1170, which describe the first arrival of an English student in Paris. He dresses and washes himself, and then walks thru the streets; enters a church and says his prayers; then coming to the schools he considers which of them he should choose. Observing the nice look of the English students, he attaches himself to their society. Many reasons influence his choice. He finds that they have a good tone, that they are winning in their talk and expression, that they are clever fellows with good heads on their shoulders, that they "tip" freely and detest stingy people, that they have many dishes for dinner and drink without restraint.

> Moribus egregii, verbo vultuque venusti,
> Ingenio pollent, consilioque vigent.
> Dona pluunt populis et detestantur avaros,
> Fercula multiplicant, et sine lege bibunt.

It should in candor be added that the writer of these lines had the bias of patriotism. He was himself an Englishman.

The great English scholars and thinkers of the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries were proud to claim membership of the University of Paris. John of Salisbury, the Humanist before Humanism, studied there for twelve years and for part of that time under Abelard himself. Edmund Rich of Abingdon, Saint Edmund, who was the first to teach the new Logic of Aristotle in the Oxford schools, was a student at Paris. So was Roger Bacon, the father of experimental science in England. Duns Scotus, the "subtle doctor," taught in Paris as well as in Oxford, and the "doctor invincibilis," William of Ockham, in whom scholastic thought culminated, was also associated with both universities. Between no universities have the intellectual and personal ties been so close as

they were between Oxford and Paris in the thirteenth century. Both were gilds of masters. In constitution, in customs, and in the technical phases of academic life, Oxford recalled Paris. The later history of the colleges at Paris and Oxford was indeed very different, but Dr. Rashdall has shown that it was a master of Paris, William of Durham, who in 1249 left to the University of Oxford the endowment for a little community which proved to be the germ of University College, Oxford. And about 1266 Sir John de Balliol, after being scourged by the Bishop of Durham for some injury to the Church, established at Oxford a hall which, in its first constitution, was an imitation of the halls of Paris.

France, we may say, gave England much of the form of its ancient university institutions, and inspired Englishmen with the love of scholastic philosophy in which they excelled.

French influence was strong in the English grammar schools down to the middle of the fourteenth century. Higden, who wrote his *Polychronicon* about 1327, says that in his time, and ever since the Normans first came into England, school children were compelled "to leave their own language and to construe their lessons in French." But John de Trevisa, who in 1385 translated and edited Higden's work, added a note that this custom was prevalent down to the first appearance of the Black Death in 1349, after which there was a great change, so that when he was writing, nearly forty years after the First Death, "in all the grammar schools in England, children leave French and construe and learn in English." This great change was probably due to the death or departure of the French priests in consequence of the Black Death. The break in educational tradition thus caused by the plague cleared the way for the common use of the mother tongue in the English grammar schools. Two famous schoolmasters did much to encourage the use of English in the grammar schools, and the movement strengthened the growth of national feeling which was one of the distinctive marks of the time. But in methods of teaching Latin the old influences held their own. One of the two Latin grammars most used in the schools was written by a Frenchman, Alexander of Ville Dieu in Normandy, who kept

a school in Paris and wrote in 1209 his *Doctrinale puerorum*, a grammar in Latin verse.

The next great wave of French influence in English education affected, for the most part, the teaching of boys in the wealthier classes of society. It culminated in Locke's *Thoughts concerning education*, published in 1693. In Locke we see the influence of Montaigne, of Descartes, and of the Gentlemen of Port Royal, just as clearly as, later on, in Rousseau we see the influence of Locke. The point of view of Montaigne is singularly congenial to many English writers on education. They like his tilts at pedantry; his admiration for physical exercises which harden the body and train it to endure ; his care for many accomplishments like riding and shooting; his belief in the educational value of travel; his scorn for mere book-learning; his grumbling at the great public schools; and, above all, his belief that the chief business of a liberal education is to form the judgment. All this comes out in Locke, as well as the advice that an English parent, like Montaigne's father, should get as tutor for his son a man who could himself speak good Latin and would allow the lad for a time to speak nothing else.

But in Locke we trace an even stronger influence than Montaigne—that of Descartes. This shows itself plainly in Locke's other great book on education, the *Conduct of the understanding*, written in 1697. Descartes begins the *Discours de la méthode* with the declaration that "good sense is better distributed than anything else in the world," and that "the power of judging well and of distinguishing the true from the false, which is properly that which we call good sense or reason, is naturally equal in all men." Locke puts the same view into the forefront of his chapter on reasoning. "Every man carries about him a touchstone if he will make use of it, to distinguish substantial gold from superficial glitterings, truth from appearances. The use and benefit of this touchstone, which is natural reason, is spoiled and lost only by assumed prejudices, overweening presumption, and narrowing our minds." He contrasts the mental outlook of the day-laborer in a country village, of a country gentleman, and of a

city mechanic, and concludes, "All these men, thus unequally furnished with truth and advanced in knowledge, I suppose of equal natural parts; all the odds between them has been the different scope that has been given them to range in, for the gathering up of information, and furnishing their heads with ideas, notions, and observations whereon to employ their minds and form their understandings." Descartes's four precepts of thought underlie the rules given in Locke's *Conduct of the understanding*. In the spirit of Descartes, Locke insists that the learner must not accept anything as true which he does not clearly recognize to be so; "that in all sorts of reasoning, the connection and dependence of ideas should be followed till the mind is brought to the source on which it bottoms and observes the coherence all along;" and that "the mind should be given a fair and equal view of the whole intellectual world wherein it may see the order, rank, and beauty of the whole, and give a just allowance to the distinct provinces of the several sciences in the due order and usefulness of all of them."

But there is also in Locke the strong influence of the Port Royalists. When he was in Paris, in 1677, he bought for "young Mr. Anthony," Lord Shaftesbury's grandson, the best French and Latin schoolbooks. These, almost certainly, were the Port Royal grammars. He girds at our English lack of care for the teaching of our mother tongue and, with reference to the foundation of the French Academy, dryly remarks that "we see the polity of some of our neighbors hath not thought it beneath the public care to promote and reward the improvement of their own language. Polishing and enriching their tongue is no small business among them, and there is raised among them a just ambition and emulation of writing correctly."

Locke, however, was an advocate of private home tuition for the sons of gentlemen. Himself educated at Westminster School under one of the greatest of head-masters, he disliked the system of the public schools. But his views were at variance with the strongest current of the public opinion of his time. After the Restoration, the upper classes in England seem to have felt the unsuitability of many homes for the pri-

vate education of boys, and also the need for fusing together the younger elements in the higher ranks of society by means of the social intercourse which comes thru sharing a common school life. In England, as in Germany, plans were formed for the establishment of academies in which should be taught the accomplishments so admirably displayed by the French aristocracy. But in this country the strong character and long-continued labors of one schoolmaster turned the tide in favor of the older type of public schools. Dr. Richard Busby, head-master of Westminster from 1638 to 1695, made his school the training-ground of the most intellectual boys of the upper classes, and began the movement for reform in the spirit and discipline of the English public schools, which secured for generations their educational leadership. Busby's work shows signs of the influence of Port Royal. He wrote new Latin and Greek grammars for the use of his school and laid great stress upon the teaching of the mother tongue in his plan of education. He himself wrote an English Accidence for the use of the younger boys in the school, and allowed those of his pupils who showed a special bent for one line of study to devote to it under skilful guidance a great proportion of their time. In fact, he readjusted the older public school system to meet the chief needs of the new educational ideal which had come from France. He did this by means of a conservative reform of an old institution from within—a difficult task for which he was fitted by his strong personality, by his educational skill, and by his love for the school which he served. It is characteristic of English educational history that the impulse which came from new social needs and from the admired example of France, instead of causing the decay and downfall of the old schools, ended in regenerating them thru the labors of a far-seeing and masterful teacher who was conservative in his loyalty to what was sound in the old traditions.

But tho Locke did not succeed in persuading the great majority of Englishmen to withdraw their support from the old public school training, his writings had a profound influence upon the ideals of education for English boys of the upper classes. We see this in Lord Chesterfield's training of his son.

The boy has a French tutor. And Lord Chesterfield gives his son in 1747 the model at which he is to aim. "A Frenchman, who with a fund of virtue, learning, and good sense, has the manners and good breeding of his country, is the perfection of human nature. This perfection you may arrive at, if you please, and I hope you will do so." On the intellectual side of the young man's education, Lord Chesterfield is fond of urging the value of the best French schoolbooks of his time. He recommends the French grammar of Port Royal and sends in 1747 a copy of "the Greek roots, lately translated into English from the French of the Port Royal" with a message, "Inform yourself what the Port Royal is. To conclude with a quibble; I hope you will not only feed upon these Greek roots, but likewise digest them perfectly." The ideals of the highest French culture were always in Lord Chesterfield's thoughts. To attain to the best French models of address and manners was *avoir du monde*, and thus to know how to behave in all companies as a cultivated French gentleman would behave, was the social knowledge to which he most desired that his son should attain.

In England, as in Germany, during the later years of the seventeenth century and the greater part of the eighteenth, French models were admired as the pattern of polite behavior. This yearning after French elegance was felt in circles very remote from those in which Lord Chesterfield shone, and we find amusing traces of its influence in books which attempted to teach English children how they ought to behave. In 1672 there was published in London the eleventh edition of a book called *Youth's behavior or decency in conversation amongst men*, "composed in French for the use and benefit of their youth and now newly turned into English by Francis Hawkins." It was so much valued, the author tells us, that a learned scholar from Oxford came to him and laid down ready money for 250 copies of a new edition, saying that he was going to keep a great school in the city of Norwich, and wished to use the book for the benefit of his pupils. Another doctor "of great learning and eminent place" sought out the publisher in his shop in Fleet Street and, giving him great thanks for the

printing of the book, bought all he had that were bound in leather, adding that the work was too good to be stitched in paper. Here are some of the precepts given in this valued book. "In yawning, howl not. And thou shouldst abstain, as much as thou canst, to yawn, especially when thou speakest, for that showeth one to be weary. But if thou beest constrained to yawn, by all means for the time being speak not, nor gape openmouthed, but shut thy mouth with thy hand, or with thy handkerchief, if it be needful turning thy face to another side." Another page gives maxims for behavior at table. "Take not thy repast like a glutton. Break not thy bread with thy hands, but cut it with a knife, if it be not very little or very new. Taking salt, beware that thy knife be not greasy when it ought to be wiped, or the fork. One may do it neatly with a piece of bread, or, as in certain places, with a napkin, but never with the whole loaf."

It was, however, thru the writings of Rollin, inheritor of the traditions of Port Royal, that the educational influence of France percolated most widely thru English teaching in the middle of the eighteenth century. Rollin's *Traité des Etudes* was published in two instalments in 1726 and 1728. In 1748 Robért Dodsley, a bookseller in Pall Mall, obtained leave from King George II. (thru Lord Chesterfield) to publish "a practical book in two volumes, illustrated with maps and useful cuts, entitled *The preceptor*, containing a general course of education wherein the first principles of polite learning are laid down in a way most suitable for trying the genius and advancing the instruction of youth." This book, which follows the lines of Rollin's treatise, went thru many editions for the guidance of English pupils and their teachers.

And a few years afterwards the wider curriculum which French influence had brought into secondary education found a still more powerful advocate in Joseph Priestley, whose *Essay on a course of liberal education for civil and active life*, published in 1765, marks the entrance of the new ideal of liberal culture into the secondary schools of the English middle class, then rapidly rising in social influence and political power.

In English writings on education thruout the eighteenth century we find traces of the influence of Fénelon. In *Télémaque* (1698) France gave to England almost as popular a young person's story-book as twenty years later England gave to France in *Robinson Crusoe*. Jeremy Bentham, for example, who was at first forbidden by his parents access to any book of amusement, was given Telemachus by his French tutor about 1755, and said of it afterwards that "the romance might be regarded as the foundation-stone of his whole character, and the starting point whence his career of life commenced." The writings of Fénelon and of Madame de Lambert (1647-1733) greatly influenced English ideas about the education of girls. They fortified the better form of the old tradition, itself an outcome of the Renaissance, and helped to ward off the baser kinds of reaction which were lowering the ideals of the training of girls. William Law, a careful reader of Fénelon, made the bad education of girls the subject of a challenging chapter in his *Serious call* (1728), which was one of the most widely read of English books in the eighteenth century and reached thousands of homes where no work on the theory of education was ever heard of. Of the influence of Madame de Maintenon there is much less trace. And it was in the homes of the more serious of the gentry and upper middle class that the better ideas about girls' education prevailed. The girls' schools were patronized for the most part by families of lower station, and seem to have been as a rule vapid and silly. At least, nearly all the English books on girls' education which were published in the eighteenth century, lament the bad influence of the schools. But it must be admitted that writers on education are apt to be severe censors of what is being done in their own day. The state of things may have been better than they believed or thought well to admit. At any rate so shrewd an observer as Adam Smith exprest himself in the *Wealth of nations* in 1776 as well satisfied with the education of girls in his own day. "There are no public institutions for the education of women," he wrote, "and there is accordingly nothing useless, absurd, fantastical, in the common course of their education. They are taught what their parents or guard-

ians judge it necessary or useful for them to learn; and they are taught nothing else. Every part of their education tends evidently to some useful purpose, either to improve the natural attraction of their person, or to form their mind to reserve, to modesty, and economy; to render them likely to become the mistress of a family, and to behave properly when they become such. In every part of her life a woman feels some conveniency or advantage from every part of her education. It seldom happens that a man, in any part of his life, derives any conveniency or advantage from some of the most laborious and troublesome parts of his education." But this testimony of Adam Smith would be stronger if he were not making by contrast a rhetorical point against the endowed schools for boys and the old universities which he so heartily disliked.

Rousseau's *Emile,* which appeared at the moment when the Jesuits were being expelled from France, was translated into English at once. In England, as elsewhere, it profoundly changed the point of view from which people approached the question of education. It made them think afresh about the fundamental principles. The greater part of them indeed were far from accepting Rousseau's conclusions. But they were forced by the book to reconsider many things which they had accepted as customary and sufficient. John Wesley read *Emile* as he rode along the country lanes, and wrote in his diary that the author was a coxcomb. The heat of the expression shows that the book had left a mark on his mind. Thomas Day, on the other hand, a friend of the Edgeworths and afterwards the author of *Sandford and Merton,* hailed Rousseau as the first of mankind. Richard Lovell Edgeworth brought up his own eldest son on the principles of *Emile,* and the two volumes called *Practical education* which he published with his daughter Maria in 1798 show many traces of Rousseau's influence. Day went further in his admiration for the new ideas, and chose two young girls, one from an orphan asylum at Shrewsbury and the other from the Foundling Hospital in London, in order to educate them on philosophical principles with a view to marrying the one in whose case the experiment should turn out most successfully. One of the

girls, however, proved invincibly stupid, and the other Day judged to be wanting in strength of mind.

The great wave of reform in popular education which began with Rousseau's writings reached England eventually not from France but from Switzerland and Germany, when Rousseau's ideas had been reshaped by Pestalozzi. But, before that happened, the spirit of English education had been touched by Rousseau's influence thru the change which it brought about in books written for children. Madame de Genlis, however, his critic and imitator, was more to the English taste than Rousseau himself. In *Adèle et Théodore,* the young mother of a family tells an improving story nightly, in a series to be called the Castle Evenings. This probably gave the model for Mrs. Barbauld's *Evenings at home* (1792), and for Miss Edgeworth's *Harry and Lucy.* It was for insertion as a short story in the latter book that Thomas Day began to write *Sandford and Merton.*

The great group of French philosophers and statesmen who, before the Revolution, probed the question of national education in France, had such an effect on English opinion that it looked for a time as tho England was about to set its hand to the task of building up a system of elementary schools for the needs of the people. But the outbreak of the Revolution frightened the English friends of social reform and put off the accomplishment of educational plans on any considerable scale for nearly a generation. The conservative classes regarded with alarm any proposals to establish a system of universal education as likely to diffuse revolutionary ideas and to promote seditious propaganda. Their fears found expression in speeches like that made by Mr. Davies Giddy in the House of Commons in a debate in 1807 on Mr. Whitbread's Bill for establishing a plan for the education of the poor. He argued that, " however specious in theory might be the project of giving education to the laboring classes of the poor, it would in effect be found to be prejudicial to their morals and happiness; it would teach them to despise their lot in life instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments to which their rank in society had destined them;

instead of teaching them subordination, it would render them factious and refractory; it would enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity; it would render them insolent to their superiors; and in a few years the result would be that the legislature would find it necessary to direct the strong arm of power against them and to furnish the executive magistrate with much more vigorous laws than were now in force." It is significant that this was the speech of no pig-headed country squire but of a man who was President of the Royal Society, who encouraged Sir Humphry Davy, and supported in Parliament the claims of science and art. Thru a sharp division in political and religious opinion, the views of thoughtful English people on the question of elementary education, for the masses of the nation, had become polarized. Extreme views became prevalent on both sides, and the hope for the establishment of elementary schools on a common plan, in the districts which had become populous thru the Industrial Revolution, had for a time faded away. Two social ideals were in sharp conflict in England. Each involved an educational system, but under very different influence. In this conflict, reformers of a moderate spirit found little foothold for their plans. The terror of seeing the French Revolution reënacted in England held back many who in quieter times would have furthered schemes for educational improvement. And the result was that, during a number of most critical years when a generation was growing up amid the squalor of the new factory towns, England did little to grapple with its most pressing social need.

In this period of social alarm, French influence was strong in two ways. To the majority it was a bugbear, standing for all that was dangerous and destructive. But to small groups of active-minded reformers it was an inspiration. Tho at the time, so far as the public organization of education was concerned, the practical outcome of French influence was small, French thought was incessantly at work in England, slowly shaping the ideas which were destined to bear fruit in every department of English administration. One great idea which took root in English thought during the French Revolutionary

period was that the education of the people must be a national work. This idea we owed to France. Adam Smith, himself under the influence of the Physiocrats, had urged its acceptance in England, so far at least as elementary education was concerned. But it was the enthusiasm caught from the early days of the French Revolution that gave fire to the idea and made it appeal to the conscience. Thus it was that Wordsworth welcomed the thought as much as Bentham. To both of them the idea came thru French channels. But when Englishmen had to decide how this plan of national education should be realized, they found themselves angrily divided into two opposing camps, in each of which prejudices and antagonisms were deepened by the very fact of their social division. One group aimed at a system of secular schools under the authority of the State. The other looked to the Church of England as a body to which should be intrusted the chief part of the gigantic task of covering the country with schools permeated with the influence of religion and faithful to the old ideas of social classification. The long delay which took place in England before the power of the State was brought to bear upon the problem of national education was due to this deep division of opinion. Men were divided in their convictions as to what the State should aim at in the work and which of the two groups of conflicting ideas it should favor and promote. The delay was in many ways socially disastrous but—the forces being what they were—inevitable. It ended in compromise. The State became the supervisor and financial guardian of a dual system of schools, tho neither half of the system was in full accordance with the first principles of its most logical supporters. The Church of England took its place alongside of other religious bodies as one of the representatives of the denominational idea in educational organization. The advocates of secular education found themselves obliged to modify their plans in deference to the strong local feeling in favor of retaining religious teaching in the vast majority of schools.

It is hard to say which of these two opposing influences did most to win the long and hard-fought battle for the organiza-

tion of elementary schools in England on national lines. To arrive at a true judgment, we have to get behind many perverse and prejudiced expressions of heated opinion. Great numbers of the clergy and of lay members of the different churches worked with devoted energy and single-minded purpose for the establishment of schools. It would be a great error to ascribe their work purely to zeal for denominational propaganda. A much wider and more generous purpose inspired what was most fruitful in their labors. On the other hand, they enjoyed special advantages in their efforts. Established interests were on their side, and the action of Government, tho niggardly when compared with the needs of the case, favored the Church rather than its rivals. It is probably true to say that the bulk of the work of building up a national system of education was done in the name of the great religious bodies, and especially in that of the Church of England. On the other hand, the most persistent advocacy of a higher standard of intellectual efficiency in the English elementary schools came from the group which had at heart no love for denominational teaching, and felt close affinity with the French idea of national education organized by the State upon a secular basis. In the long-drawn struggle between these two groups of opinion, there was immense, but inevitable, waste of force. Yet the educational movement slowly advanced, and each group of workers learnt much from the criticisms and outlook of the other. But it is undeniable that when we trace back to their first source the intellectual principles which inspired the more radical of the English educational reformers during this period of confused struggle, we find that source in France. Influence and ideas from Switzerland, from Germany, from Holland, and from America, colored the aims of English educational reformers as the nineteenth century advanced. Many of the principles which were at first regarded as indisputable weakened under criticism. But it remained true that for two generations the strongest intellectual influence on the radical side in the English educational movement was that derived from French sources, and especially that which was derived directly or indirectly from the writings of Helvétius. It was the read-

ing of Helvétius that first convinced Bentham of his own genius for legislation, and set him, more than any other agency, upon the principle of measuring social utilities by the test of the greatest happiness of the greatest number. It was Helvétius who helped to inspire William Godwin, and thru Godwin, Robert Owen. It was Helvétius who, thru Spurzheim, gave the intellectual foundations to the thought of George Combe. These four names, Bentham, Godwin, Owen, and Combe, stand out as those of great pioneers of radical ideas in English education. Their belief in the potency of education thru its effect on character was the belief of Helvétius. But Robert Owen, the most thorogoing of the four, realized that educational reform in the larger sense must involve complete reconstruction. Thus he became the forerunner of a school of educational thought which is likely to play a great part in England in future. The belief that national education involves something much greater than a mere system of schools; that it must be the outcome of a social order, and not simply that of an intellectual discipline imparted in the schoolroom, characterizes all the most powerful English writing on educational subjects. It underlies the most opposite views as to the form which educational administration should take. It is the key to English thought upon educational problems. For the masses of the people, the best of education must come thru social discipline and thru social relationships. Thus the root of the educational difficulty lies in the social question. This is the thought which has worked like leaven in the educational opinion of England. It has never been satisfied by any program of merely intellectual training, and it is significant that that which did most to free John Stuart Mill from the narrower intellectualism of the older English radicals, and to turn his thoughts towards some new social synthesis as the true remedy for many of the evils wrought by individualism, was the social doctrine of St. Simon.

Since the Revolution, every great stir in the social and political thought of France has affected English educational ideas. French venturesomeness and political fearlessness have been to England a beacon or a challenge. They have inspired Eng-

lishmen to new efforts of social improvement, or have forced them to examine the grounds of their loyalty to their own institutions, and to reform those parts of them which most urgently called for amendment. Thus, the sweeping away of the old French universities in 1793 was one of the causes which set far-seeing men at Oxford on the work of university reform. The University of Cambridge had led the way half a century before, but it needed the spectacle of the French Revolution to produce at Oxford the spirit of conservative reform which, by means of the new Examination Statutes of 1800 and 1807, gave a fresh intellectual life to the University, and resulted, thru the work of Dr. Arnold at Rugby and thru the Tractarian movement, in renewing the vigor of the public schools and of the Church of England. The stir of political thought in France in 1830 and 1848 had its effect upon the movement for educational reform in England. It was in 1833 that the English Government made its first grant in aid of elementary education, and from the enthusiasm of 1848 date the strongest efforts which have ever been made in England to use educational agencies as a factor in social reform by organizing them, as F. D. Maurice and the Christian Socialists urged, upon a social basis and in organic connection with the social activities of the nation. In many other respects English education owes a large debt to France. The very words "normal school," which at first were always applied to the training colleges, show that in England the idea of training teachers for their professional duties owed much to French example. The idea of the English higher elementary school was borrowed from the French écoles primaires supérieures. And Professor Mackay and other workers in the movement for establishing new independent universities in the great English cities drew encouragement and arguments from the labors of Monsieur Liard, of Monsieur Lavisse, and of the other distinguished writers and teachers who have borne part in the brilliant academic renaissance in France.

The visit of the representatives of French education whom we welcome to-day comes at a critical time. Profound changes have taken place in English social life and have

brought with them the need for readjustment and great improvements in our system of education. Never has the mind of the nation been more open to new suggestions, never more willing to consider new educational ideas. But we can not merely copy what has been done elsewhere. No other nation has a more complex problem to solve than we have. We shall have to work out our own system in our own way. But now, as in former years, no influence which reaches us from abroad has a more stimulating power than the influence of France. It challenges us by its appeal to the fundamental issues. It insists that education must be a social work, touching all the needs and aspirations of the community, and not simply a utilitarian device for the increase of material well-being. French educational thought delights us by the lucidity of its reasoning. It forces us to clear our minds. It appeals to us with the grave and measured dignity of a high tradition, the most unbroken tradition of literary culture in Europe, a tradition which links the modern world with the civilization of Rome.

M. E. Sadler

University of Manchester

IV

THE POSITION OF LATIN AND GREEK IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

III LATIN AND GREEK IN OUR COURSES OF STUDY

There yet remains the question whether Latin and Greek as educational instruments are being utilized in our country in such a way as to yield the best results for training and culture. To this question a negative answer may unhesitatingly be given; but the causes are deep-seated and complex.

I

The amount of time given to the classics in the average school in which Latin and Greek are taught, and in the schools in which instruction is given in Latin alone, is insufficient; and in many colleges the trend is so strongly in the direction of other subjects that a large proportion of the students who most need the training afforded by the study of Latin and Greek are diverted from the pursuit of these languages and devote no time to them while in college.

Let us suppose that a graduate from a high school with four years of Latin enters college and pursues the subject thru his college course for four hours a week. If he had five exercises in Latin each week in the high school, the total amount of his Latin in eight years of study will be 36 year hours, a year hour being reckoned as one exercise a week during the school year. We may suppose that the same student had Greek for five exercises each week for two years in the high school, and for four hours a week for two years in college; the total amount of his work in Greek will be 18 year hours.

Americans frequently speak as if we were working out our educational problems in isolation; yet we are a part of the European culture movement, and the anomalies of our present

situation are in no small degree due to the attempt on the one side to superimpose a German university upon a college of English origin, and on the other to shape all secondary education along the lines of preparation for college. Neither the experience nor the practical conclusions of Continental education should be lightly put aside by us; and since reforms have within recent years become operative in the secondary schools of both Germany and France, it is worth while to bring into contrast with American conditions the amount of time given to Latin and Greek in the different types of the Gymnasium and in the Lycée.

The time devoted to Latin in the Gymnasium in Prussia (since 1902) is 68 year hours, in Saxony 71 to 73, in Baden 72, in Bavaria 66, and in Würtemberg 81; in the Realgymnasium, in Prussia 43 to 46 year hours, in Saxony 54, in Baden 56, in Bavaria 36, and in Würtemberg 81; in the Reformgymnasium at Frankfort, 52 year hours.[1] The average exercise in the German secondary schools is five to ten minutes longer than in our high schools; but without taking this into account we see that the student of the Gymnasium has on the average nearly twice as many year hours of Latin as the American student who carries the study thru his entire course in school and college, and more than three times as many year hours as the student who pursued the subject for four years in the high school and then dropt it. The Latin requirement just given for the Prussian Gymnasium added six hours to the requirement in force from 1892 to 1902, for the reason that the reduction of the amount of Latin which was accomplished by the "Reform" of 1892 was, after ten years of trial, considered as having perceptibly weakened the gymnasial training. Among the advocates of a full classical course, in the debates which marked the period of transition, was the distinguished physicist Helmholtz, who maintained "the superiority of the classical languages over the modern as a vehicle for mental training, on the ground that the native language and the other modern languages, which are learned chiefly

[1] For these statistics I am indebted to Commissioner of Education Elmer E. Brown.

by oral practise and imitation, or in so far as they are so learned can not so exercise and develop intelligent, logical thought as the classical languages with their full system of inflectional endings and their concise and elaborate methods of showing the grammatical relation of the individual parts of the sentences to each other and to the whole." [2]

In the Realgymnasium also, which offers no work in Greek, and has a curriculum in some respects similar to our Latin-scientific course, the German student everywhere except in Bavaria gives more time to Latin than does the American youth who pursues the subject for five periods a week in the high school and four in college; he devotes to it more than twice as much time as is allowed for the subject in most American secondary schools. Greek averages 36 year hours in the Gymnasium. We shall not go far astray if, taking into account the difference in length between the German and the American recitation period, we estimate that the average German student who has completed the course of the Gymnasium has had in Latin the equivalent of 80 year hours of the American high school: that is, he has spent in Latin classes about four times as many minutes as the American high school graduate; and that to Greek he has given considerably more time than is ordinarily devoted to the subject in an American classical course in both school and college.[3]

The curriculum of the French secondary schools underwent a thoro-going revision in 1902. The course of the Lycée previous to that time had been extremely narrow; and among the influences which determined the direction of reform was an acquaintance with American high schools, the manysidedness of the work of which naturally imprest educational leaders of France who chafed under the limitations of the old system. Yet in the reformed French secondary school the student who chooses Latin in the "First Cycle" [4] must pursue

[2] *School review*, vol. 10 (1902), p. 466.

[3] The number of year hours of Greek in the Gymnasium in the different German states is as follows: in Prussia, Baden, and Bavaria, 36; in Saxony, 36 to 42; in Würtemberg, 40.

[4] EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, vol. 25 (1903), p. 143; Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1902, vol. 1, p. 691.

it for four years and devote to it not less than 26 year hours; while in three out of the four courses open to him in the "Second Cycle," covering three years, he must continue Latin, devoting to it 9 or 11 year hours in the classical course ("Section A"), 7, 9, or 11 in the modern language course ("Section B"), and 7 in the Latin-scientific course ("Section C"); only one of the four courses, the science and modern language course ("Section D"), makes no requirement of Latin. Under this arrangement the great majority of the graduates of the Lycée who started with Latin will have had a minimum of 33 year hours in the subject; as the recitation periods in secondary schools in France are longer than with us, it is plain that the French student spends in Latin classes about twice as much time as the American student who pursues the subject for four years in the high school, quite as much time, in fact, as our student devotes to Latin who studies it for five periods a week in the high school and for four hours a week during his entire college course. To Greek 6 year hours are devoted in the ancient language section of the "First Cycle" and 10 hours in the classical course of the "Second Cycle," with 2 hours optional, making a total of 16 or 18 year hours for the French student who completes the classical work of the Lycée; the amount of time given to Greek is about equal to that spent by an American student who commences the study of Greek in the third year of the high school and continues it through the sophomore year in college. Latin is begun in the Lycée at the average age of eleven, and is continuously studied for seven years; in the Gymnasium the pupil commences the study of Latin when ten years of age, and continues it for nine years.

In giving Latin so prominent a place in secondary schools, and in devoting so much time to Greek, it can not be said that those responsible for the reformed curriculums in Germany and France have been unduly influenced by tradition. It is true that European educators are disposed to move more slowly in the adoption of reforms than we in this country are, and that no step is taken without an attempt to forecast all possible consequences. But Latin and Greek have their place in German

and French secondary schools today because they have been proved, not by theory but by experience, to be the most effective instruments available for certain phases of secondary instruction; and the extension of the study of them over so many years is in accordance with the basal principle well stated by Compayré:[5]

> The virtue of secondary teaching lies, in large measure, in its duration, in its slow influence upon the intellect. The best teachers need the help of time, if they wish, not to furnish the memory with hastily acquired and badly digested knowledge, but to act upon intellectual habits and accomplish the education of the mind, which is truly the essential aim of secondary instruction.

In recent years, as Commissioner W. T. Harris pointed out, marked progress has been made in our secondary schools in the concentration of work upon a small group of studies considered of prime importance, in place of the scattering which was formerly prevalent. One of the studies assigned as by common consent to a central place is Latin.[6] Yet if we examine the Latin course of our high schools we find a pitiable condition. The machinery of secondary administration, taking its Latin standard from the requirements of colleges for admission, is attempting, with the use of five or even four short periods a week, to secure the results of Latin study that in Germany and France,[7] with much better average teaching, are secured in five or six years with six, seven, or eight longer exercises each week. The later age at which the American student commences the study of Latin is a doubtful advantage. Losing sight of the basal principle laid down by Compayré, our secondary education as a whole is making the study of Latin

[5] EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, vol. 25 (1903), p. 133.

[6] EDUCATIONAL REVIEW for December, 1906, p. 465.

[7] A comparison with English secondary schools in this respect seems unnecessary. The English have awakened to the fact, perceived earlier by the French, that the American high school presents in the elasticity of its curriculum an element worthy of imitation, and are expanding their system of secondary education. But as the reports are confirmed regarding the inferiority of the American Rhodes Fellows at Oxford in classical training not only to English and Scotch students of the same age but even to students from the Colonies, no further evidence is needed to emphasize the superiority of British secondary instruction in the classics to our own. The British student who takes Latin ordinarily begins to study it at the age of ten or eleven years.

above all else a hurried cramming of facts. This is in accordance with the spirit of the age manifest among us, which demands immediate results and in its eagerness for knowledge—knowledge being frequently assumed to be the panacea of all ills—tends to lose sight of the truth that the development of power is the fundamental aim of education, that the acquisition and educational use of this or that mass of facts become valuable primarily as a means to an end, and only secondarily thru the retention of the facts themselves. In the comparatively few secondary schools in which instruction in Greek is still given [8] the position of this study is relatively better than of Latin; for the student of Greek, having already had two years of Latin, attacks the second classical language to greater advantage, and the average teaching of Greek is better.

2

Educational experts inform us that in our American schools about two years are lost between the first grade and the end of the high school course. This means that the student at the age of eighteen is studying subjects which he should have had at the age of sixteen; and that if he goes to college, he must either attempt, without adequate preparation, to do work requiring a foundation of previous training which he has not had, or devote two years of his college course to studies which belong more properly in the secondary field, or endeavor to effect a compromise and ride both horses. In many of the smaller colleges, and in the Arts department of some universities, the work of the first two years is wholly or in great part prescribed, and if a student enters with Latin and Greek the administrative system tends to keep him in the same lines of study until he has had six years of Latin, or about 28 year hours, and three, four, or, if he enters from a three-year Greek course, five years, approximately 14, 18, or 23 year hours of Greek. In not a few of the larger institutions offering collegiate work, however, the rapid extension of the elective system, due in part to the influence of a superimposed university

[8] Educational Review for December, 1906, p. 466.

system under the name of Graduate School, has caused the secondary character of the first two years of undergraduate work to become obscured.

We are confronted not with a theory but with a condition. It is not necessary to cite the reports of entrance examination boards; the concurrent testimony of those who teach freshmen classes east and west goes to prove how crude and unformed intellectually, how like an "unlicked cub" is the average first-year student; at how great a disadvantage he appears, in point of mental training, when compared with a classical student of the same age from the English Public School, the Gymnasium, or the Lycée; and how much he needs, as an aid to self-discovery and self-direction, the control of a firm masculine hand in studies requiring concentration, exactitude, and grasp, and effective also in developing power of expression.

Instructors with the university point of view naturally desire to have the college student introduced to their subjects as soon as possible, and to pursue them as far as he can; hence the extraordinary multiplication of courses open in many institutions to undergraduates,[9] hence also in recent years the projecting downward into the freshman work not only of subjects before offered exclusively in later years but even of courses in which the instruction, following university methods, is given largely by lectures. Prominent in this class of subjects is history. There is no disagreement among educators regarding either the necessity of work in history for all students who wish to have a liberal education, or the desirableness of maintaining a continuity of instruction for a period of years; yet the question may well be raised whether, under present conditions, the time spent upon history in the freshman year might not be devoted with greater profit to other subjects, whether in fact even the man who is to specialize in history and has had only the ordinary high school course in Latin will not in the end make a better historical scholar if he puts upon Latin or Greek

[9] The number of semester courses open to undergraduates at Cornell University, for example, is 510; at the University of Michigan, 698; at the University of Wisconsin, 681. Of interest in this connection is the paper of President Bryan in a recent number of the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW (February, 1906) on "The excessive expansion of the course of study in American universities."

the hours of freshman work which he is tempted to give to his favorite subject. In some institutions no other single factor has been so potent to turn students away from the study of either ancient language as the throwing open to freshmen of lecture courses in history, which, from the nature of the subject and the methods of instruction,[10] are less exacting in the requirements of daily preparation, and less difficult to "pass." The historical field is attractive to all students having a spark of human interest; but even the freshman is not slow to find the line of least resistance, and not loath to follow it. In these days when the study of history lays a just emphasis upon the knowledge and use of original sources it seems anomalous that students should be able to come up into advanced historical work and try to become historians without the ability to read the Magna Charta in the original. An even more striking anomaly is the teaching of Greek history in college courses by men who know not a word of Greek.

So long as the degree of Bachelor of Arts was given only to graduates who had had Latin and Greek in college, that fact was influential in maintaining both the ancient classical languages upon a firm foundation not only in the colleges but also in the schools; but now, in the unsettling which accompanied the reaction from the old system to that of the "omnibus" degree where this has been adopted, the pendulum has swung too far the other way. Altho under the system of the "omnibus" degree students who elect Latin and Greek are disposed to take more courses and hours than formerly, and altho the work of the average class is of better quality than when Latin and Greek were required for graduation, the fact should not be ignored that a relatively small proportion of college students are brought into contact with classical studies; this means that, viewing the American college in the light of its complex function as a preparatory school for the professions and as a school of liberal studies, or finishing school, we are warranted in con-

[10] How difficult our college teachers of history find the problem of adjusting their work to classes containing large numbers of freshmen may be seen in the discussion published in the last annual report of the American Historical Association (1905) vol. 1, p. 149–174.

cluding that in many colleges the resources of classical instruction are not being utilized in a way to minister adequately to clearly defined educational needs. There is current a misconception in regard to the nature and aims of classical study, which by many college students and professors is lookt upon as something technical and apart from ordinary scholastic interests, which in fact should be pursued only by those who will "specialize" with a view to becoming teachers of Latin and Greek.

3

The reasons why the older professional schools in the United States with few exceptions were established in educational isolation, apart from colleges and universities, are historical, and need not be entered into here. One important consequence is that up to the present time it has not been possible to make a satisfactory adjustment between the professional schools as a class and the other units of our educational system. The cleavage is narrowest between the college maintaining the classical course and the theological seminary; the gap is broader, and much more difficult to bridge, in the case of schools of engineering, medicine, and law. In the past twenty-five years these three classes of schools have made great advances in the enlarging and strengthening of their curriculums. This expansion has involved, directly or indirectly, a readjustment of the requirements for admission. As was to be expected, the tendency has been to exact or encourage a more extended preparation of the student before entering upon professional studies; and of late many professional schools have thrown their influence in the direction of making a fixt requirement of the whole or a part of a college course as furnishing the desired preliminary training in the best way.

Meanwhile, however, the college course, toward the utilization of which for preliminary training the professional schools have been advancing, has in many institutions undergone a complete transformation. Twenty-five years ago it was a fairly stable aggregation of studies, which were pursued in a fixt

order, and which, when viewed as a whole, were assumed to be both disciplinary and liberalizing. If a student having a college diploma entered a professional school, the diploma itself was an index of his preparation in respect to range as well as quality of work. But at present, such is the chaotic condition of many college curriculums and so great is the freedom of choice offered to the student that the professional schools are confronted with a twofold difficulty. In the first place they frequently make complaint that the students who now enter with a college diploma are not as a class so well able to carry the heavy and exacting work of the professional curriculum, which allows slight freedom of choice, as were the students who came up thru the old college course of studies wholly or in large part prescribed; and in the second place the college curriculum has in many institutions so lost all semblance of unity and consistency that whether two years of college work, or the whole course, should be made a fixt requirement for admission to the professional school, it would be unsafe to assume that the student entering with such preliminary training had had any particular study (excepting elementary English) or had even learned how to study according to the professional standard.

The case of Latin and Greek in relation to professional studies is the same as that of mathematics and other more difficult subjects the "practical" bearing of which is not on the surface obvious, but of which the pursuit has been considered desirable as a part of a general education. It is already evident that professional competition in this country will be much more severe in the future than in the past; he who will serve the next generation acceptably as a lawyer, a physician, an engineer or a clergyman must have an equipment superior to the average equipment of the present time. The question is not how the man of exceptional gifts may be made ready for his life work; it is rather by what process the average man who desires to study engineering, medicine, law, or theology may best be trained in preparation for the technical studies thru which he will obtain his professional equipment.

The opinion was formerly prevalent that preparation for

engineering studies should above all else emphasize mathematics and physics; for a medical course, chemistry and biology; and for a course in law, studies in history and economics. Now, upon second thought and in the light of experience, leaders in the field of professional education are agreed in the position that what is needed as a preparation to enter upon any technical course is a trained mind rather than a premature amassing of information along technical lines. "Let us have a trained man; we will give him the professional knowledge and skill," is a remark frequently made today. This throws the whole question of the preparation of prospective professional students into the domain of a general or, as many prefer to say, a liberal education.

The general subject of preparation for professional courses is too large to be entered upon here, and the limits of this paper do not permit the citation of further testimony [11] in regard to the place which the ancient classics should have in it. Men who have forgotten much of their Latin and Greek, and who find themselves handicapped by lack of technical knowledge, sometimes express the wish that they had spent upon professional subjects the time which they gave to the classics and mathematics, forgetting that without the power gained by the training of these basal subjects their command of technical data would be even less adequate. The trend of opinion, so far as it is definitely formulated, seems to be that under present conditions the prospective clergyman, lawyer, physician, and engineer should alike have an extended training in English, both language and literature; should have a semester or a year of "college" mathematics, part of the time being devoted to a brief review of the history of mathematics and a presentation of the relation of mathematics to other subjects; a course of "college" physics, biology, and either chemistry or geology, or both, it being understood that the science courses should be introductory in the larger sense, the subjects being presented in their relations to the sum of knowledge as well as in their fundamental principles; introductory courses in economics and philosophy; courses in French and German,

[11] EDUCATIONAL REVIEW for January, 1907, p 64 ff.

with an opportunity to take work also in Spanish and Italian; one or two years of "college" history, articulated with the history of the schools; one or two years of "college" Latin; at least two years of "college" Greek for students looking forward to the study of theology, one or two years for prospective students of law and medicine, and a year of "college" Greek or additional pure mathematics for the prospective engineer.

The professions, except the ministry, are at the present time not suffering from a lack of candidates; the number of those preparing for medicine, law, and engineering is in excess of the present demand. In education the race is not to the swift; in rendering to society the service of developing an educated leadership the professional schools would do well to remember that quality is of greater importance than numbers, and that one first-class man in any profession is of greater value to the world than many men of second or third rank. Tho the advance of science in modern times has vastly increased the sum of knowledge, has opened up illimitable vistas and has effected changes in educational perspective, the enthusiasm of research should not blind us to the fact that the vast bulk of new knowledge, in the anthropological sciences as well as in the sciences of nature, is not well adapted for use in elementary or secondary or even collegiate training. No substitute has yet been found to take the place of Latin and Greek as educational instruments, not only for a general training but also for the training that looks forward to professional study.

4

The teaching of Latin among us suffers from the same causes which affect the teaching of other subjects. These are, chiefly, on the one hand lack of knowledge of Latin, lack of a clear perception of the aim of Latin study, and lack of a serious purpose in teaching; on the other hand, too many recitations in the day, the lack of books and of illustrative material for the classroom, and, in the high schools, the nervous haste which comes from attempting to do in a given time more than can possibly be done well.

These defects are in part due to the fact that our secondary teaching is in no inconsiderable degree in the hands of young women without adequate preparation for their work, who engage in teaching as a makeshift and either grace the schoolroom with their presence briefly on the way from the commencement stage to the altar, or if they remain for a period of years continue to teach without an ambition for self-improvement. These must not be confused with the large class of conscientious teachers who are striving to do their work in the best way but whose acquaintance with Latin is so meager that they are handicapped at every step and turn to new "methods" of instruction as a drowning man clutches at a straw. Over against both these classes stands the large body of well-prepared and earnest teachers of Latin and Greek who are accomplishing results that are more than creditable when we take into account the disadvantages under which they labor in the lack of time for the proper doing of their work and in the lack of facilities. All honor to this loyal legion of classical teachers who, laboring often in a commercial or philistine atmosphere, have nevertheless retained their enthusiasm for sound scholarship; have constantly enlarged their horizon of knowledge, and have continued to be an inspiration and help to others.

Not a few of those who have failed to appreciate the value of the study of Latin and Greek think of these subjects as they were taught thirty or forty years ago by a certain class of schoolmasters who presented the Greeks and Romans as unearthly beings raised on a pedestal, before whom the modern world should fall down and worship; viewed their language as an intricate mechanism, and ground the student upon forms and constructions without a scintilla of literary appreciation. It is sometimes difficult for the critic to realize that the teaching of Latin and Greek has shared in the educational progress of the last half century; that the good classical teacher of today is not merely the teacher of a language but also, so far as time and opportunity permit, the interpreter of a civilization of which the language is only one manifestation; and that the aim of instruction in the ancient classics is not merely to

secure the best results of close and exact language study but also to inspire an appreciation of literature and, in a word, "to accumulate upon the present age the influence of all that was best and greatest in the life of the past." This aim is sometimes lost sight of by teachers of good ability who have had an inadequate or one-sided preparation, and even by young doctors of philosophy whose perspective has been warped by concentration of study upon one part of a great field; but our classical teaching as a whole is directed toward high ideals, and will not fall short of its opportunities. No study is more interesting to students of any age than Latin and Greek when properly taught.

That so large a proportion of our teachers of the classics are ill prepared is not more the fault of the teacher than of the system. So long as the compensation of the teacher remains as low as at present in most schools and many colleges, so long as the tenure of positions in public high schools is subject to the uncertainty of an annual reappointment, so long, finally, as administrative officers in passing upon the fitness of candidates frequently attach little weight to the range and quality of scholastic attainments, it may be expected that the average of preparation for classical teaching, which involves a long and expensive course of study for him who wishes the best, will be raised but slowly.

In order to remedy our failure as a nation to utilize Latin and Greek as we should in our educational system it will be necessary first of all to extend the study of Latin downward so that it may be pursued by students for two or three years before the present high school age; that is, the study of Latin should be commenced in the seventh or sixth grade. How this result may be brought about is a question of educational administration which should occasion no great difficulty in a well-organized system of city schools. Such an extension of the Latin course would make it possible to accomplish results more nearly comparable with those obtained in the secondary schools of European countries, and so would effect a saving of time at the upper end of the course. Greek should be

commenced at least as early as the second year of the high school; but it is difficult to see how this study can make much progress, at least in the West, until the school authorities are more disposed to allow small classes to be formed in the subject and teachers of Latin manifest a warmer interest in the promotion of Greek studies. The immediate future of Greek is largely in the hands of teachers of Latin.

The second remedy lies in such a readjustment of the curriculum in colleges having a loose elective system as shall bring a relatively larger number of students into contact with classical studies in the earlier part of their course.

In the third place, the utilization of the classics in preparation for professional study should be made sure by explicit recognition accorded to them among the requirements for admission to professional schools and by means of a fixt requirement in combined literary and professional courses.

It is sometimes said that our educational system is justified by its product, and that the number of successful men among us is sufficient evidence of its efficiency. Such a generalization makes no account of the fact that there are many other elements which enter into the problem besides the training of the schools. Owing to the opportunities afforded by the conditions peculiar to a new and rich country, many men have risen to prominence and affluence practically without educational advantages, but that does not disprove the value of education; on the other hand, it is possible for a man to become successful not on account of his education but in spite of it. The problem is to bring each life into vital contact with the knowledge, and subject it to the training, that will best fit it for living happily and well, rendering its due service to society; in the light of both theoretical considerations and experience, we may safely assert for Latin and Greek a larger place in the educational process than they have in our country at the present time.

Francis W. Kelsey

University of Michigan

V

THE FATHERLAND[1]

Dear Children:

The Fatherland is a territory inhabited by men who follow the same laws. In order to constitute this territory and community a great effort has been made. Small inhabitants that you are of a corner of our grassy and wooded Thiérache,[2] you who have a quick and practical mind, and also a quarrelsome disposition, and who retain in your speech a number of words and expressions of the old Picard dialect, you do not resemble very much the little Breton boys who from their rocky coast look dreamily at the Atlantic Ocean and who speak their old Celtic tongue, or the little children of the south of France whose Provençal ejaculations are heard on the shores of the Mediterranean. There was a time when Picardy was farther away from Provence and Brittany than America or India is nowadays from France. In order to create our nation a collaboration of several centuries was needed between Nature, which gave us our share of land and sky, and Politics, which gave us fire, sword, and also mind and heart.

History has taught you how our kings built up the Kingdom of France. They acquired one after another its various provinces. The first bond of union between Picards, Bretons, Gascons, Provençals, etc., was that they had a common master. Our forefathers became all Frenchmen because they were all subjects of the king of France, and the first common national fact was obedience. A whole people became interested in the

[1] An address delivered at the Commencement exercises of the Public Schools of Nouvion en Thiérache (Department of Aisne). Translated by Professor Adolphe Cohn, of Columbia University.

[2] La Thiérache is the name of a small territory, formerly a part of the province of Picardy, now included in the Department of Aisne, of which it forms the north-eastern district.

acts of the king. Together our ancestors participated in warlike undertakings, either with their blood or with their money. A victory of the king filled the whole kingdom with joy, a defeat of the king filled it with dismay. A habit was contracted of experiencing together identical emotions. There appeared in France what I shall call national sensibility. At the same time the common bond of union manifested itself by a great mental labor. The French nation created the French language. That we speak today a tongue which is one of the most beautiful in the world is due to the pains taken by our fathers to make it what it is, and their labors lasted for centuries. In our tongue our fathers exprest their feelings and their thoughts. A national literature is, as it were, a general confession of a nation; therein is said all that is thought by that nation about nature and man. French literature, therefore, exprest the special spirit and character of France. Within the political community it created a moral community.

For a long, very long time the soul of France remained in accord with the king. It was a belief of the French people that the king was the representative of God upon earth, that he was to be loved and served as God himself is loved and served. Young republicans that you are, it is hard for you to understand such sentiments. You see each epoch has its ideas which the following period understands no longer. All the same these things were legitimate in their own time. It would be sheer blindness to refuse to acknowledge that they were formerly living things, living a strong, real life, just as only thru sheer blindness could we today wish to make them live again, for they are dead now forever.

For a time came when the king and France quarreled with each other. The quarrel was of the king's own seeking. He went so far even as to display stubbornness in his determination to quarrel, for our ancestors' patience was admirable, and so long, so long! The kingdom suffered on account of manifold abuses: inequality, injustice, despotism. The soul of France made its protest louder; it created the French ideal of liberty, justice, and humanity. And this was the French Revolution.

With the fall of the king came the fall of the old castes and privileges which created special rights within the nation. All Frenchmen were given an equal right to their Fatherland, which was declared One and Indivisible. France then loved herself in herself and not in a man. But what did she love specially in herself? Her grand ideal of justice, liberty, humanity. So that she was justified in loving herself with passion as she did. Our revolutionary patriotism is one of the most beautiful sentiments recorded in history.

And today, more than one century after the revolution, after so many vicissitudes, after this dazzling glory and these terrible disasters, after these counter-attacks of the Past which we call restorations, and these reprisals of the Present, our revolutions, today, in the world so prodigiously transformed, by what sign does France recognize herself, by what sign is she recognized by others? By her grand ideal of justice, liberty, and humanity.

Your Fatherland, my children, is therefore not simply a territory, it is a product of human labor, begun centuries ago, continued by us and destined to be continued by you. The long labors of our fathers from our origins down, the memory of their deeds and thoughts, the monuments of their genius, our speech, our mind, our conception of life, all this together with the rich beauty of our land and the clemency of our sky, with the poetical diversity of our country's landscape, with our northern mists and our southern splendor, with our superb mountains and our beautiful plains, with our green ocean and our blue sea—all this is your rich inheritance, it is the Fatherland, created by nature, created by our soul.

But your Fatherland is not the only Fatherland in the world. Other countries surround you, the formation of which had a different history from ours, slower in Germany and Italy, more rapid in England. They have their laws, their language, their literature, which they have created. Each one of them, like France, has exprest its sentiments and ideas upon nature and humanity. Each one of them has its genius, different from ours. Each one of them is loved by its children even as France is.

What feelings, what conduct must these countries hold towards each other? This is one of the questions which at the present time occupy, excite, and divide men's minds.

For centuries the feelings were feelings of hatred, the conduct was war. It looked as tho no one could love his own country without hating the country of others. War, it is true, was unavoidable at a time when the states, still in process of formation, quarreled about their respective frontiers. War often was a phenomenon of growth and a settling of boundaries. By reason of state was thus fostered the natural instinct of violence which is in us, for humanity is not natural in mankind. War became one of the great functions of the state, the kings were born war-chiefs, some men were their born lieutenants, other men chose war for a profession, and earned thereby their living. Armies became permanent, and wars were made to employ them. The years of peace seemed to be empty years; they were not many, moreover; Louis XIV reigned seventy-two years, and waged war during nearly fifty. Among the spring motives of the warriors of old we find, besides political interest, pride, pleasure, habit. It was a terrible period in the history of mankind. It seems barbarous to us now.

Morality has changed. Our great eighteenth century preached the idea of humanity and taught the value of human life. The war epic of the Revolution and the Empire left Europe in need of peace and in love with peace. In all countries labor assumed extraordinary intensity, and labor loves peace and insists upon it. Trade and swifter means of transportation caused the peoples to mingle with each other. Then in nearly every country military duty has been substituted for the military profession, and a national army for a professional army. Then again the governments of today have to deal with public opinion, and most of them with a national representation. This is a great novelty; the question of war and peace is to be decided now no longer simply by those who send others to be killed; those who run the risk of being killed themselves have something to say about it. This changes everything. Wars become more and more infrequent; the

governments themselves preach peace, love it or appear to love it, sign treaties of arbitration, and the outline has been drawn of an international Court of Justice. Mankind seems to be organizing itself for peace.

My children, I am one of those by whom such efforts are applauded in all sincerity. It is certain that war is loved by few, hated by many, feared by all. War has entered upon its period of decay; he who works against it works in the direction of the Future. But I know also that my eyes shall not be able to see a reconciled Humanity, and that your eyes shall not see it either. Centuries were needed in order to weld the old provinces of France into a kingdom: who can say how many centuries it would need to weld into one nation, Humanity, regions which are so different from each other in every way? Even between the nations which call themselves the most highly civilized peace is not assured; a few weeks ago there was talk of nothing but war between European nations. The reason is that in Europe there are still some sovereigns, not many and not forever, to be sure, but we must take our time as it is, some sovereigns, I say, who have the power of unchaining war and directing it with their finger towards the spot which they wish struck. But war may arise from something else than a sovereign's whimsical fancy.

We must not allow ourselves to be misled by phrases which are on everybody's lips. But a moment ago I spoke to you, myself, of the intermingling of various peoples with each other. There are orators to celebrate the beauties of our unending streams of travelers, they bid us look upon the crests of white steam flitting over sea and land; but under them I see ironclads and torpedo boats, and upon our railroad carriages I see such warlike indications as: thirty-six men, eight horses. The proudest of the monarchs who are still on the throne by the grace of God considers it one of his various duties to foster the business interests of his subjects. It is not quite sure that commerce is always in favor of peace; it may perfectly well some day prefer war, if it seems to promise an improvement of business. Finally, my children, the habit of war is very old, and very old too the habit of national selfishness. Some

instincts are sleeping in us which may be aroused suddenly from their slumber. No, I shall not see a reconciled Humanity, you will not see it either. You will live as we do under the régime of separate Fatherlands.

The question comes back to me: "What sentiments, what conduct must one man's Fatherland hold towards another man's Fatherland?" And another question is linked with this one: "What sentiments, what conduct must we hold towards our own Fatherland?"

I have already almost answered.

The various countries must consider each other as works of Humanity, which is in each of them, with its natural diversity, for it is by the will of nature that Humanity presents various aspects. Nature will never allow the sons of men to be all alike; fortunately, for this universal likeness would be nothing better than intolerable ugliness. Nature is a harmony, so is Humanity. Each one of the various countries which it has created, on various lands, under various skies, in various circumstances, has its own aptitudes, its character, its genius, and each of them contributes to the beauty of the whole. He who serves his Fatherland serves Humanity in the station in which he has been placed by his birth.

If you understand the word Fatherland, my children, you will respect the Fatherlands of other men. You will object to having done to them what you would object to having done to yourselves. In you will finally die out the spirit of domination, violence, and hatred. It is not necessary to hate other nations and to wish to subdue them in order to love one's own Fatherland.

Your own country you will love otherwise, but not less, and even more than in their own time our ancestors loved it. Your love for it will be instinctive; it will be also rational.

There is a natural instinct which, without subjecting us to the ideas and customs of our ancestors, without condemning us to the servile obligation of repeating indefinitely their gestures, binds us to them by a pious feeling, makes us conscious of a continuous national existence, and with the charms of long memories gives us the force and quietude which, starting from

the deepest roots, rise up with the unending sap of human nature.

But to us Frenchmen it is difficult to follow a purely natural instinct. We are not unlike the children who are bent upon knowing what is in their drums that makes the big noise. This is the reason why we have burst open the many drums behind which other nations, which have preserved them, are still keeping up the rhythmic gait of military step.

Well, if you wish to argue, let us argue. Suppose you tell me: "It is due to chance alone that I came to the world in France. I might as well have been born in England, in Germany, or in Russia. I do not admit that I should have to be bound all my life thru the act of a city clerk writing in a book, on the day of my birth, my name, which I did not know and for which I did not care. Before anything else I was born a man. I wish to belong only to Humanity, which alone I wish to serve."

What you call Humanity is not yet in existence; it is a grand and beautiful idea, it is not a thing. You needs must have a determined place where to act, and I make bold to say that you will find it impossible to serve Humanity except thru the medium of a country, of a Fatherland. Look then among the various countries and find the one that Humanity has the least to complain of.

What charge of inhumanity does any one bring against France? By whom is she curst? Do *we* have an Ireland, a Schleswig, a Finland, a Poland? Do *we* retain by force in our community men who withhold their souls? Quite the contrary, are we not those who one day dreamed of the liberation of the people, and have not the ideas of our Revolution had this good fortune that even the violent deeds of the Imperial period have had their share in implanting them in the worst entangled thickness of superannuated despotism? This proud and great Germany of today, is it quite sure that but for the enlightenment, stirring shocks, ill treatment received from us, but for our 1789 and our 1848, it would not, while probing all the problems of philosophy, have kept on bowing with all the

depth that it can give to its demonstrations of respect, to a crowd of princelets?

Moreover history teaches us that one nation only has mingled its blood with the blood of those nations which strove for existence in the last century and a half. This is the nation that waged war in America for the independence of the United States, that sent an expedition to the Peloponnesus for the independence of Greece, that laid siege to Antwerp in order to establish Belgian independence, and made war in Lombardy for the independence of Italy.

We are this nation.

Besides this, within our own boundaries are we not at work trying to free Humanity from the shackles which it accepted when younger? Gone the divine right of kings, gone the monarchy, gone the castes, the hereditary hierarchies, gone the power given to the church of coercing men's souls. No obstacle can stand before our determination to establish Justice.

Finally France has suffered, and is suffering still, on account of her humanity. It would be better for her had the neighboring nations remained humble and divided against themselves. She would be easier if she had preserved all the forms of obedience, for obedience is a good pillow by which to induce good sleep. If then it is true that, moved by an irresistible internal force, she has acted more in the interest of others than in her own, if she has thus incurred the blame of patriotic men, ought she not thus to have earned the gratitude of those men who refuse to contract within the boundaries of a country their souls, filled with the love of justice and humanity?

My friends, you may enjoy in all security your right of loving, of preferring France, since reason itself demonstrates that you are not misled by the instinct which leads you to love and prefer her, since serving her is the most effective mode of serving the human kind.

And now in order to bring to an end this long and grave discourse, let us form wishes together; I had almost said, let us pray:

Let France remain strong among the nations!

Let her be strong by her justice!

Let her, by her justice, destroy in herself all the forms of injustice that are not unavoidable; and those that are, let her soften; let her democratic laws raise at last all Frenchmen to the dignity of men, which many of them have not yet reached!

Let her be strong by her freedom!

Let the Republic inflexibly persevere in her purpose to deprive the powers of the past of all authority, but take care not to offend a single conscience in its religious faith, for experience has taught us that such injuries are the most painful of all!

Let the Republic be strong by her army, for if she should let her weapons fall she would have no merit in preaching peace, the need of which for her would be too apparent, and the people would give her the answer once given by the foxes to one of them who had allowed himself to be caught in a trap!

Let the flag of France, until the day comes, the date of which we can not even imagine, when the nations after making a bundle of all standards and for a last time saluting these venerable symbols, will destroy them in a huge bonfire, let our flag wave high in the sky; for it bears neither monogram, nor escutcheon, nor heraldic beast; it belongs not to a man, or a family; it belongs to a free people, respectful of other people's freedom, and wishing them to be free; and if this flag of ours had to be lowered one would see on the soil grow the shadow of double-headed eagles!

Let our eastern frontier offer no provocation, but make its power to resist plainly visible; let not a man, not a cartridge be missing, so that no one either on this or on the other side of it should fear or believe that it may be crost by any one who wishes to cross it; so that no one should dare to offer to take us in tow—us whose destiny it is to be a glorious and adventurous vanguard!

Let the sons of France remain in the van, proud of the honor but also conscious of the peril, and in a union made unbreakable by this double feeling let them lead the difficult march towards the far-off peace which will some day be given to mankind by international wisdom!

Ernest Lavisse

University of Paris

VI

CHURCHES AND THE SCHOOLS[1]

This hateful quarrel between church and school has been fought out from so many points of view that it would scarcely appear possible for anything new to be contributed; and yet I venture to think that Lords and Commons alike have ignored one aspect of the situation. They assume that tests and inquisitions, inquiries into "fitness to teach"—in this school a Cowper-Temple test, in that a High Anglican or Lower Anglican test—may be imposed at will; and they have not paused to inquire whether the teacher has a conscience which may forbid him to submit to any test of belief whatever. Teachers have said little on this point, and silence may have been taken for consent. The case of the present writer may perhaps be paralleled by that of many other teachers who do not write to the press, who want nothing more than to be left in quiet, trusted to do their work in the schools without agitation, but who are deeply moved by the spectacle which the House of Lords has exhibited during these last weeks. I have written much upon education, but I have never yet sought to influence public opinion on these fundamental matters of religion, because I had been bred up to believe that the fine common-sense of public men in England would always tend towards civil and religious liberty; in breaking silence now I know that I am voicing the quiet conviction of thousands of school teachers, such as those with whom I have been associated for twenty years past.

It is, perhaps, specially incumbent upon a man in my position to write, because we who teach in the universities are safe from

[1] This brief paper by Professor Findlay is reprinted from the *Westminster gazette* of London. It throws a flood of light upon some aspects of the educational struggle of England.

attack. We are the only body of teachers in the country to whom the State insures freedom from clerical domination (I refer to the newer universities; the battle has been fought once at Oxford and Cambridge, but it may need to be renewed). Our University Charter reads: "It shall not be lawful for the Court, by any statute or otherwise, to adopt or impose on any person any test whatever of religious belief or profession in order to entitle him or her to be admitted as a professor, teacher, student, or member of the University, or to hold office therein or to graduate thereat or to enjoy or exercise any privilege thereof." Feeling, as I do, that demands for tests and confessions strike at the root of school morality, I should be wanting in moral courage if I rested content in the security of a university charter and refused, from fear of personal disquiet, to help my professional brethren. I think that even many clerics, who cling to tests and confessions, must admit that the situation is somewhat humiliating for them. We adults in universities, students and instructors alike, have asserted our freedom; we are grown men, and you can not touch us; we are too much respected by the common opinion of mankind to allow you to bind our souls; but you keep your hold upon children, capturing them before they attain capacity for private judgment; and you hope to hold the school teachers, who are your inferiors in political power and in social prestige. Most of them, indeed, are women.

The old historic struggle for religious liberty takes new shape with each generation; what appears as tolerance to one age may be spiritual tyranny to the next. Our fathers thought that a conscience clause for children was a noble display of tolerance and charity, but we are coming to see, as Mr. Birrell has already pointed out, that something more is required for our children today. Now, there are two new elements in the situation which specially affect the teacher's conscience, and on these he will take his stand for liberty. First, every one begins to see that religious power and influence, whether among adults or children, are represented less and less by formal creeds and confessions. The clergy themselves admit this; while seeking to lay these burdens on the bairns and on the teachers, they

themselves are rejecting such burdens more and more, under the plea of higher criticism, scientific reservation, and the like. Is the teacher to be made a greater power for religious influence by accepting formal bonds against which the clergy themselves are constantly in revolt? This is not the yoke of Christ, but it bears the hall-mark of religious oppression. And the defense is the old, old defense of tyranny; the bishops are terrified at the increase of secularism: just as papists thought to frighten Europe by the perils of a godless anarchy which would engulf the Western world if it refused obedience to Rome, so the Bishop of St. David's warns My Lords that tests for teachers are needed because there are so many godless teachers in the schools already. In plain English this means that we are to have a heresy hunt in every school, that young men and women, at a time of life and in an age when beliefs both in morals and in religion cause the deepest inner struggles, are to be forced to answer a final yea or nay in order to secure their livelihood.

The second element is an increased knowledge of and respect for childhood. There are thousands of teachers who know the limits of the intelligence and emotions of a child, and will no longer pretend to make out of a child what never has been and never will be made. We can train children to be reverent in the vague presence of the Unseen and the Eternal; we can help them to love sacred story; but we can not intrude our adult experience of God upon their childish minds, and we are beginning to find a professional conscience which will forbid us to obey the clergy in these matters. Many of the clergy do not understand children; they do not live among them or play with them; the little bairns are just so much material to be captured for the churches. The Master taught us to "become as little children;" it would almost seem as if the bishops desired to reverse that exhortation.

If we admit that these two elements are growing in strength, we shall recognize that they are being combined with a third and more subtle feature in our attitude towards religion—an attitude which the clergy find it difficult to understand; I am convinced, however, that it goes to the heart of this quarrel

between priest and teacher. The professional priest, accustomed to handle with ease the most private affairs of a confessional, facile in discourse upon the deepest emotions of the heart, can scarcely sympathize with a layman—and still less a laywoman—who declines to expose his inner life to public gaze. The human spirit, even in a poor uncertificated teacher, has depths of misgiving, of desire, of doubt and faith, which are too intimate to be fingered by a local authority, or even by an estimable parish clergyman. Until two human beings stand in such close relations as exist between parent and child, priest and penitent, husband and wife, we have no right to start a personal inquisition. Our association with our fellows depends upon reserve—which represents in the spiritual life what chastity represents in physical relations. We take our fellows upon trust; we believe that, in the lump, they are as good as we are; that high scruples, generous desires, true religion, are found there as well as in ourselves.

Now, the school teacher takes, professionally, this wholesome, sane attitude towards his scholars, and he claims that those who manage the school shall display the same reserve, and the same confidence, in their relations to him: it is because the priest will not—can not—understand this fundamental attitude towards life that the gulf between teacher and priest grows daily wider. For years past we teachers have been telling the nation that there is peace within the school; that if you leave teachers and children alone the conflict is at an end. Peace and order reign within the school because the teacher, whether or no he imparts religious instruction and conducts religious functions with his scholars, respects the sanctuary of the child's heart and of the child's home; he knows that religious development must bide its time, and come to fruition (helped, of course, by the spiritual ministry of the church) outside the school walls and within the secret places of the heart.

But the minister of the ecclesiastical type is not content to wait; his power, his influence, consist largely in authority over the inner motives and beliefs of his fellows, and, to put it brusquely, he wants a breed of teachers who will assist as his acolytes at the solemn mysteries where he presides. How ap-

palled would such men be if they realized the contempt, the quiet hatred, which many teachers, in talk among themselves, express for these clerical efforts, designed to capture the half-formed souls of little children, to bind down the lay-teacher as an extra-ministrant, deprived of the privileges but compelled to bear the burdens of the clerical order!

I present here a view of the inner attitude, as I believe it to be, of the great mass of English teachers. It is consistent with imparting Bible knowledge, with the use in school of a simple form of prayer, of hymns, and of reading from the Bible or other sacred literature; it is not consistent with proselytism, or with any direct personal appeal to a child about his relation to God, to religion, or to a church. It can be maintained without violation of the teacher's spiritual freedom, for it relies upon the teacher's honor as an honest man, who respects both the child's soul, the parent's authority, and the religious ideal.

True, there are a minority of teachers and a minority of parents who stand in much closer relationship with their church and its priests. Some are Romanists, others Anglicans; and it is right that the State should deal tenderly with their consciences, and should deal liberally with the few schools which will be ready to make sacrifices for conscience' sake. (But the archbishop and his friends want to endow this minority so that it can proselytize.)

I can not in a short paper refer to the claims of this minority more fully, but no one questions that there are only a small minority. I believe I am expressing the mind of the great bulk of English teachers, who spring from the people, who reflect the life, the religion, the morals, good and bad, of the people from whom we spring. We must be taken as we are, trusted to contribute our own modest share to the moral and religious nurture of the young, without interfering with or being interfered by the church and the home.

A few of the clergy actually are the salt of the earth, and understand the moral issues here raised even better than the teachers do. But the great mass of the clergy—many outside the Establishment as well as within it—are at one with the House of Lords; and one fears that both commons and cabinet,

for the sake of compromise, will yield to clerical influence and decline to make a stand on behalf of spiritual freedom. If the history of religious conflict affords any precedent, the teachers (on their own and the children's behalf) must look for victory not to the State but to themselves; and the weapon of defense is that ancient and honorable weapon, *dissent*. Organized dissent is the appropriate defense against organized religious tyranny; the State has before now sought to impose tests, its acts of uniformity and supremacy have created corresponding forms of active dissent, and it may be assumed that history will repeat itself. One can perhaps imagine that a body of teachers, faced with the alternative of abandoning their calling or submitting their conscience to the priest, might unite together in some solemn act of covenant or declaration which might read as follows: "I, a teacher qualified for service in the public schools, declare my intention to train my scholars in habits of reverence towards God and religion, and in respect for the institutions of my country, both civil and religious; but I decline, in connection with my professional duties, to make any statement of my beliefs or practises, either as regards religion or politics. I refuse to answer any inquiry into these matters or to solicit office on the ground of my belief or opinion in these matters."

The reply of the cleric to such a declaration is exprest in spirit by the bishops: "Cast him out," they will say, "for he that is not with us is against us." And the outcome of such a struggle may be studied in the history of religion in England from the days of Wyclif to the days of John Wesley.

Let me conclude with a plea to men of culture and refinement, who have no personal interest in the conflict and are inclined to stand apart, regarding it as a hopeless and endless strife among the sects. How gladly would one take that line and shut out the whole scene from one's attention! The clergy in days gone by have done much for education, and teachers of all grades might well be reluctant to take a decisive line in opposing them; dissent has, indeed, always been a painful task. Some university teachers, notably Principal Lodge and Professor Muirhead in the *Hibbert journal*, have sought to com-

pose this quarrel, and they will doubtless deprecate the tone of hostility which I assume; but there are a few matters—the final things in conduct—about which a man can not compromise. If, for the sake of peace, we sacrifice character, we had better close the schools; if my analysis of the situation is right, we are threatened with a sacrifice of morality to clerical aims. Every problem in education—technical, secondary, feeding of children, training of teachers—sinks into insignificance compared with the moral issue involved in the uprightness of the teacher. It is my hope in writing this paper to fix the impression that this conflict does go to the roots of conduct and of the moral standard; and, so regarded, every man is compelled, when his own mind is made up, to take his side and abide the issue.

J. J. Findlay

University of Manchester

VII

DISCUSSIONS

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY TRAINING: A CRITIC CRITICIZED

The article on "American university training" in the November number of the REVIEW has doubtless been read with mingled surprize and protest. Surprize, that a champion of German thoroness should display such ignorance of the subject which he attempts to treat; protest, that such incompetent utterance should be dignified by reprint. The article was, however, evidently written with sincerity of conviction; and, having appeared in a widely-read German publication, its reproduction here was quite in order,—if only to give opportunity for correction of the author's egregious errors. The most glaring of these was noted in an editorial comment. The writer is so plainly dissatisfied with everything but his own opinions, so out of joint with his environment, wherever it may be, that the reader will hardly have taken him seriously, even when he has shown evidence of intelligent observation. His turgid rhetoric, his incoherence and diffuseness, make it difficult, moreover, to follow his argument. He has admittedly dispensed with illustrations and proofs, expecting the reader to be so imprest by his high-sounding generalizations that he will accept his naïve premises as axiomatic.

The emphasis which the author places on his experience, on the immediateness of his impressions and the meditation thereto devoted, suggests the desirability of more precise information as to the length and circumstances of his period of observation. The time was one academic year; the place, a university preëminently devoted to technical rather than to humanistic studies. This was unfortunate, since in the preponderance of the former he saw a disregard of the latter, making no allowance for the conditions determining that pre-

ponderance. True, his knowledge was limited by his experience, but he could hardly suppose that a single instance would suffice for a sweeping generalization. He must know that at certain German universities the students of philosophy and philology are in a minority, while at others they far outnumber those of any other faculty. Here was an opportunity for some of that scholarly investigation for which he was trained, tho it would have involved the examination of such commonplace material as statistics. That one academic year seemed sufficient for these observations is, perhaps, not to be wondered at, since an older and more famous visitor from Germany recently published his impressions after one week's sojourn in this country.

The instruction given by Dr. Küchler included intermediate courses in reading and composition, a course on German literature in the nineteenth century, and one on "German land and life." It should be added that he was considered a successful teacher and that his departure was regretted. He did not come with the intention of remaining permanently; had he done so, he would doubtless have become one of the numerous company of German instructors who are doing such excellent service alike to their native and to their adopted country.

No one will dispute the thesis, that it is the office of the university to conserve intellectual ideals. Nor will the signs of immaturity in our cultural development be denied. That the American university fails to advance this development, that it is a negligible factor except as an aid to bread-and-butter getting, is a charge so grave that it should be substantiated by more than the assertion of a single observer in a single place. Even if his observations were correct for a particular place, it would be impossible to deduce from them a general estimate. Dr. Küchler supposed, erroneously, that a single university is typical here to the same degree that it is in Germany. He doubtless meant to be fair and unbiased, but he should have made allowance for his limitations and, above all, should have made sure that he was measuring by the right standard.

Every reader of his article will have noticed his failure to distinguish between the college and the university, a distinc-

tion now so familiar to German educators—at least to those who discuss American institutions—that the author need not have come here to learn about it. Had he, on the other hand, condemned a careless application of the word "university," and insisted on a clear demarcation of college and university in institutions which embrace both, he would have found deserved support. It is true, he knows of graduate and undergraduate work, but makes the German university the standard of comparison alike for both. Yet elsewhere he specifies the four-year course as the average attainment of the American student and admits that it gives him "perhaps somewhat more" than the *Gymnasium*. He is correct in stating that the majority of our students "end their preparation and go out into life" at this point. But how about the graduates of the *Gymnasium* and the other secondary schools of Germany? Do they invariably continue their training and proceed to "independent investigation and production"? A fair, and an interesting question would be, how does the percentage of *Abiturienten* matriculating in the universities compare with that of college graduates who become candidates for the higher or the professional degrees. In such comparison allowance should be made for the difference between the German *Primaner* and the college senior, for that bridge between the student's boyhood and manhood which the last year or two of the American college provides and which does not exist between *Gymnasium* and *Universität*. We know how the German student makes that bridge for himself in his first semester or two. There is a gap, and there must be a bridge, in more than the mere curriculum.

"The average American student goes to the university in order that he may secure the best possible position in the shortest possible time. Most universities are content to help their students to attain this practical end." Statements so remarkable that they deserve direct quotation. That the average American student believes a college education will secure him, *sooner or later,* the best position—in whatever lines his career may fall—is justified. That this is his sole aim, that the prize alone concerns him, is by no means so certain. Every col-

lege instructor has heard the student say that he was yet undecided as to his future, whether he would enter business or study for a profession; that his choice of career had been changed by his college course; that this course had meant for him in the training of his judgment and his reasoning faculties, in the elevation of his ideals, far more than in the acquisition of positive knowledge. Does this author suppose that the German student has no thought for the future? And why should the future be ignored in rapt devotion to the present? Is it not a duty to make the youth ready to do his part of the world's work? And the first qualification is that he shall be able to earn his living. Prosaic enough, to be sure; but the pauper is not a useful idealist. We *have* a "practical end"; it is, to make men self-reliant, better able to help themselves and hence to help their fellows.

In his consideration of undergraduate instruction Dr. Küchler displays most strikingly that ignorance and presumption which he so deplores in the American student. "The plan of instruction aims simply to impart general knowledge, or rather information." Of course; so does that of the German *Gymnasium*. The college student, prior to his junior year, at least, is not a specialist; the university student is, here quite as decidedly as in Germany. Indeed, concentration of effort is more certainly assured by the American system. The author's conviction that undergraduate instruction is "easy and superficial for students and professors alike," if established by his experience, is not subject to contradiction. It is undeniably as easy and superficial as the instructor chooses to make it. He loses sight of that other aim of college instruction, the making of a man, in which subject and text-book are of secondary importance. The elements of a subject may serve this end quite as well as a more advanced stage, and the teacher whose interest is in the learner as well as in the subject will never find his work "impersonal and unproductive." The subject may be old to the teacher; it is *new to the learner*, and the teacher's success depends upon his treating it as such. Let him bear in mind that the instruction of beginners is not so contemptibly easy as this educator would have him believe,

for upon the foundation rests the superstructure. And why this emphasis on the elementary character of American college or university work? Are the conditions essentially different from those in Germany? Does not the German begin his study of philology or economics, for instance, at the university, while the American has mastered the elements in his last year of college? And does not the German frequently make trial for one or two semesters before finally choosing his field? The fact is, Dr. Küchler's confusion of college and university is so hopeless that his meaning is sometimes not discoverable. Does he understand that a term of Gothic or Old High German is prescribed for the A. B. degree? Or does he, on the other hand, consider this an unfortunate requirement for a graduate student in Germanic philology? Which assumption is the more ridiculous?

Dr. Küchler had most interest in the study of modern languages and makes this the subject of specific criticism. He rejoices in the alleged absence of philological work on German lines and seizes the opportunity to condemn the latter. He considers this American tendency (?) sound, but finds our methods conspicuously wanting. He would demand little knowledge of philology or historical grammar from "a student who is going to leave the university at once and begin teaching." This sounds dangerously like a concession to the practical aim of satisfying only immediate demands which he elsewhere so emphatically condemns. Or would he differentiate absolutely the teacher and the specialist? It would be interesting to know more definitely about the "considerable number of American professors who believe that the literary and philological scholarship of Germany has been a great obstacle to the dissemination of literary culture in America." Still more interesting would be the grounds of their belief and the evidences of its correctness. The naïve warning to the American university not to look to Germany for a model comes several decades too late. That to the German university is uttered in time. The fine phrases about universal inequality and the ratio of independent development to cultural progress are misleading. They ignore the history of the German and the

Anglo-Saxon peoples, whose cultural preëminence is due above all to their powers of assimilation and adaptation.

That the study of foreign languages in our colleges does not lead to proficiency in speaking and writing is admitted. That the results attained are inferior, in proportion to the time spent, is not admitted. To which Dr. Küchler would retort that we are at fault in not giving more time. This is not the place to discuss the relative importance of a practical command of foreign languages in Germany and the United States, respectively, nor the relative difficulty of German and English grammar. Not every student of German is concerned to master the niceties of idiom in order to reproduce them. He may wish to use the language merely as a tool in other studies. The second-year student who incurred his instructor's contempt by declaring that he "had done enough German" doubtless had legitimate reasons for substituting Spanish. He "had laid the foundation," as was possible in two years of good work, and could now proceed for himself. And many such students do proceed. The end of study is not study, but the acquisition of power.

That the study of foreign literature is without appreciable result will be denied by most teachers, and justifiably. It is right here that our modern language instruction is most fruitful. In the time allotted the student can not learn to speak a foreign language fluently; he can and does learn to know its literary masterpieces. Happily, not by listening to the instructor's lectures, but by reading and interpreting with him the texts. There is no greater pedagogic blunder than to talk and read about authors whose work the student knows only by title. Of course "lectures are restricted to the older [*i. e.*, university] students"; so they are in Germany. The part which translation plays in the interpretation of texts is again too large a question for discussion here. That it is sometimes carried too far is undeniably true. As a means to an end it is valuable. The statement that "examination of the ethical content or literary character of the works and discussion of the author's personality are almost illusory aims," is more easily made than refuted, unless the refuter is willing to assume his

limited experience to be typical. Perhaps the numerous and widely used editions of foreign classics with adequate treatment of the phases mentioned are something of an index to the standards of instruction. I am not able to identify the American university professor who thinks that less than five per cent. of his students "read and assimilate the works of any one good author, or any single work." One wonders at his long persistence under such discouraging conditions. Perhaps he has come to recognize only one "genuine personal stamp,"—his own.

The critic was shocked at the lack of private reading on the part of our students and their consequent presumption in pronouncing "critical estimates of works and authors and things that they did not understand." Had they but realized the impression made by their fatuous utterances! One is naturally dumfounded at such assurance!

> Yet even from him we're not in special peril;
> He will, erelong, to other thoughts incline:
> The must may foam absurdly in the barrel,
> Nathless it turns at last to wine.[1]

The large domestic consumption of light reading is deplored. That we excel in its production is another of the author's unsubstantiated sweeping statements. We must have made rapid progress during the year of his residence, since the literary output of Germany for 1903, according to the published statistics, was more than 25,000, or as great as the combined output of England, France, and America. A writer in the Supplement of the Munich *Allgemeine Zeitung* remarked of this phenomenal literary productiveness: "A careful student of modern German bibliography can not but feel discouraged at the vast amount of trash, especially in the department of *belles-lettres*, that annually overflows the market. It is a diseased overproduction, caused by a restless ambition of many untutored minds to earn literary laurels . . . and indicates not literary health, but literary decadence." The quotation does not palli-

[1] *Faust*, 6811 f. Taylor's translation.

ate our crime, but merely shows that the people upon whom it is practised may not be unprotesting sufferers. Far be it from us to cast the first stone.

Dr. Küchler did not fail to discover the place of athletic sports in American universities. Altho the relative importance of athletes and scholars may be somewhat overstated, his strictures are in the main correct. It is significant that he emphasizes the two points made by the advocates of reform. It is not strange that he was, in this instance, able to arrive at correct conclusions after short observation because a single big football game is typical of all. He confesses that these excesses of American students are no worse than those prevailing at German universities. From his comparison of German and American student-life he might have inferred that there must be some expression of animal spirits, and that the problem lies in so directing that expression as to promote at once physical and mental health.

In the education of the masses Dr. Küchler rightly sees a significant phase of our culture, but here, especially, he perceives danger of shallowness and vapidity. Had he been disposed to praise where, even in his opinion, there was opportunity, he could have said much, by way of comparison, to the advantage of this country. He was prevented by his viewpoint, that of the educational aristocrat. He is, for the moment, impressed by the great educational projects which state and people alike have founded and fostered; then he realizes how "the greater extension involves, by a fatal necessity, the lesser depth," a principle which he believes to be characteristic of our university system. His thesis, that "the task of the university lies not in the dissemination of culture, but in the deepening of it," gives food for interesting discussion. If the university is to have that influence on national culture which he elsewhere claims to be its office, it must be at once producer and distributer.

It is gratifying to note that he found something to praise in our library administration. He was doubtless impressed by the practical advantage of obtaining a book five minutes after application instead of twenty-four hours, even tho it necessi-

tated "subordinating the scientific office of the library,"—whatever that may mean.

The exchange of professors, which was being planned when Dr. Küchler wrote his article, is now an accomplished fact. It is yet too soon to make definite estimate of its results, but it is at any rate no transient experiment, and it will be for its opponents to prove that it is "without inherent justification." The objections urged by this writer are either quibbles or undefended categorical statements. He is particularly distrest by what he considers the "political" aspect of the exchange. Let him remember the fundamental meaning of that word before denying to the university the right of participation. From a German the protest comes with ill grace. Does he seriously think that it is a trick of diplomacy? If so, he is correct in denying its efficacy. What harm, however, in "the strengthening of friendly relations between the two nations"? Would the absence of them avert "the serious commercial conflict" which he postulates? One very important phase of this exchange, from our standpoint, he could not, perhaps, foresee. I refer to the effect produced upon our citizens of German birth by this "embassy of culture." It brings them into immediate touch with those ideals of the Fatherland which they most cherish, and which in no wise conflict with their duty to the land of their adoption. Between them and their American fellows it promotes good-feeling and mutual respect. Nothing will so quickly lay race prejudice as the comity established by intellectual intercourse.

That no benefit will accrue to the respective universities is not proved by Dr. Küchler's saying so. The only reason he assigns is the prospectively small supply of American professors and American students—the form of this statement is characteristically contemptuous—available for the experiment. Is he opposed, on principle, to giving more than he receives? He fears that time-honored traditions are to be destroyed by this professorial migration. Does it not occur to him that international migration of students is likely to be increased? Nothing will promote it more than a semester spent with a "Kaiser Wilhelm" or a "Theodore Roosevelt" professor.

As for the economic phase of the question, has he computed how many students could be sent abroad annually for the cost of one professorship? And finally, will not the professors themselves gain insight and experience to a degree not otherwise attainable? They will be at once ambassadors and explorers, and their *Wanderjahre* may prove a valued sequel to the *Lehrjahre,* long since past. Last, but not least, they can publish their impressions and thus correct their countrymen's erroneous conception of things foreign.

Wm. Addison Hervey

Columbia University

THE RELATION OF THE COLLEGE LIBRARY TO THE STUDENT

In its relation to the student the college library endeavors to perform three special services, viz.: to supplement the instruction given him in classroom and laboratory; to extend and reënforce his knowledge of the use of books as tools and as means to literary and other ends; and to assist in making him in Matthew Arnold's phrase "acquainted with the best that has been thought and done in the world."

The new relation which college libraries bear to their constituencies is a result of the recent marked changes in methods of instruction. More specifically, it is due to the dethronement of the text-book and to the present vogue of the lecture and laboratory methods. Instead of the ancient inference that the class lecture or text-book contained all the knowledge of its subject necessary for collegiate and educational salvation, it is now expected that the instructor will impose upon his students a considerable amount of supplementary, additional, or independent study and reading.

This portion of the work of instruction necessitates the use of many kinds of illustrative material: books, manuscripts, facsimiles, maps, prints, and photographs, and here is where the relation of the library to the student begins. The library is charged with the duty of providing this illustrative material which the instructors require or advise their students to read,

study, or consult, and it is within the library walls that the use of it must be made. To enumerate the ways in which it tries to fulfil this duty is obviously impossible here. They are not and can not be always the same in all places. One or two points, however, may be emphasized.

If an instructor believes in the method of required collateral and supplementary reading, and assigns it regularly to his classes, he ought to examine his students upon it as closely as upon the subject-matter of his text-book or lectures. Otherwise, the system is but a partial success and fails to reach a majority of the class. In this connection my personal conviction is that the frequent presence of the professors in the library has an extremely helpful influence upon the students. The sight of the teacher at work there gives point to his remarks to the taught concerning the value of doing their work amid its resources.

In the room or rooms where undergraduates do their work library machinery and red-tape should rarely be visible, always at a minimum, and if possible, non-existent. The library should place its materials in the hands of the student without trouble or inconvenience to him. Classification and other details of book arrangement or administration ought everywhere to be subordinate to making the use of the books easy and even attractive to the student reader. The library officials should be competent to assist him to use or to search for his material up to the point where the expert aid of the specialist instructor may fairly be called in. Instead of referring the average student to that wonderful mystery, the card catalog, the assistants should always, within reasonable limits of course, *be* the catalog for him. In its relation to the student the maxim of the library machine should be "The least possible between the man and the book."

In accomplishing the second aim of the library the instructors and the library officials form coöperating forces. Both share in the work of showing the student how best to use the material to which he has been referred, and how to gather material of his own for independent treatment or use. Four years' experience of this sort can not fail to give a first-hand

acquaintance with many books on many subjects, and inculcate methods of book use which may readily be applied in his later career to other subjects which enlist his interest or become topics of special study.

Whether the library officials should contribute to the formal instruction of the students by offering systematic courses in bibliography is a debatable question. At present it is my feeling that college faculties should go very slowly in admitting such courses to the curriculum, and that college librarians should study all phases of the matter very carefully before pressing the claims of bibliography as a required or elective subject of instruction.

The municipal and town libraries are now in such close touch with the secondary schools that the pupils have every opportunity to acquire a knowledge of the more general and universal bibliographical tools and literary aids. Well-trained assistants in scores of reference rooms are actually imparting this information to hundreds of scholars from the public and private schools in their localities. This instruction might profitably be made more regular and formal by arrangement with the school authorities; it is my belief that it would be accepted more readily and more seriously by students of high school age than by those who have entered college; and such instruction would carry the average student just as far in knowledge of and ability to use the common bibliographical works as an elementary college course in bibliography.

When the college student has advanced to a point where the special bibliography of the subjects studied becomes important his proper guides are the professors, not the librarians. It is the instructor in mathematics who should pilot him thru the literature of the calculus; the English professor who should point the way thru the wealth of articles in *Anglia* or *Englische Studien* if the student's task is to "read up" recent critical work on Beowulf; and so on thruout each department of instruction.

The college curriculum is now so crowded with subjects of instruction, many of them of doubtful educational value, that I do not believe it would be a service to higher education to add

bibliography to the list. From the standpoint of both education and culture (the two things no longer go together) it is much more important for an "Arts" man to take chemistry, physics, or biology, and infinitely better for a "Science" man to take philosophy, economics, or advanced German than it is for them to take courses in bibliography. I should be the last to deny that in its higher and more intricate phases the subject has positive educational value, but I am very certain that few would care to pursue it to the stage where it becomes really difficult and therefore of disciplinary value.

So, in this matter, the librarian should be very conservative. Whenever he finds a student or students developing an interest in bibliography, in the history and transmission of books, in colophons, collation, the causes of rarity in books, points of difference in editions, etc., etc., by all means let him encourage that interest and give freely of his time and personal direction. But it will be best to do this informally, as he meets the students at the shelves, or as of their own accord they come to him with the queries that their use of the books has suggested. In this respect the relation of the library to the student will be both important and helpful, even tho the college catalog fails to blazon forth an imposing array of courses in bibliography.

The third main purpose of the library is to do its own peculiar part toward making the student a cultivated man, broadly conversant with the things that illuminate literature, art, and science, and exercise a refining influence upon his mind and heart. The freshman must not be allowed to get the fixt idea that the library is a place sacred to "required" (and therefore disagreeable) reading, or a spot where "grinds" alone do congregate. The library that fails to draw men to it for purposes of healthful intellectual reading and "browsing" amongst good books fails signally in one of its greatest possibilities of usefulness. But again there must be a certain attractiveness in the surroundings and an ease and freedom in the use of books if the men are to be drawn to the library for this purpose. Students will not come if they are obliged to consult a formidable catalog, transcribe its hieroglyphics upon a

slip of a particular size or color, hand it to a busy attendant, and then wait for the book to be brought. They will not spend a leisure hour among closely packed tiers of books whose titles can be read only by the aid of artificial light. Every library, therefore, should have one well-lighted, attractive room where undergraduates can have free and unrestricted access to about ten thousand volumes representing every department of human knowledge, selected by the combined wisdom, taste, and care of the faculty and librarians. From these books the students will get glimpses of subjects hitherto unheard of and unstudied by them, they will see the actual works of the men whose names only they have heard in the classroom or seen in the footnotes of their text-books; whole ranges and alcoves of books upon a single subject will show them the extent to which it has engaged the minds of men of the past and of the present; from the classification they will learn something of the interdependence of and relation between the various branches and divisions of learning; and everywhere curiosity will tempt them to dip into volumes which may inspire a real life-interest or give a lasting spiritual or intellectual impression. Decidedly, all this is far from "scientific," but with equal decision I believe it to be an opportunity that may legitimately be offered by a college library, and if accepted by the student will contribute to his intellectual equipment something of genuine value which in later years he will look back upon with gratitude and appreciation.

Given a tactful librarian who, with a word of kindly counsel or explanation, can put these browsing youths on the right path in their use or estimate of the book that has caught their attention, a man with whom they can freely discuss the new worlds that have just "swum into their ken,"—and the contribution that the college library can make to the education of these men of the future is neither small nor unimportant.

WILLIAM NEWNHAM CARLTON

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY
HARTFORD, CONN.

VIII

REVIEWS

The spirit of democracy—By CHARLES FLETCHER DOLE. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1906. 435 p. $1.50.

Mr. Dole's book is an explanation and a defense of what he conceives to be true democracy. It is a reasonable and thoughtful presentation of some of the most pressing problems in our contemporary political life. It lets in the light of rational analysis upon the dark places of a host of everyday assumptions and fallacies, and is well worth reading and discussing in secondary school and college classes in economics and government.

Lord Randolph Churchill—By LORD ROSEBERY. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1906. 202 p. $2.25.

Lord Rosebery's brilliant style and sparkling epigrams are admirably displayed in this study of one for whom he felt "all the affection of long friendship, but who was always his political opponent." His essay is, in effect, a series of reflections upon Winston Churchill's remarkable *Life* of his father, which Lord Rosebery justly characterizes as "a fascinating book, one to be marked among the first dozen, perhaps the first half-dozen, biographies in our language."

Lord Randolph Churchill had an extraordinary personality. His public career was really but six years in length. In that time he powerfully imprest himself upon British opinion and won a distinguished place in the House of Commons. His political program was the creation of an unusual insight into political forces and of an unusual foresight as to whither those forces were tending. It came too soon to be practicable, and it was quite impossible as Toryism. Lord Randolph's attempt was splendid, but it was not politics.

Lord Rosebery touches deftly upon the leading traits in this

fascinating character as well as upon the main incidents in his career. One sees Lord Randolph as a serious-minded, sharp-tongued, irresponsible boy in politics, giving and taking the hardest knocks, and trusting withal the British people. Full of zeal for his ideas, he took little heed of the obstacles to their fulfilment. He was a brilliant meteor who flashed all too quickly across his country's sky.

Lord Rosebery's book is full of charm, and one who begins it will not lay it aside till the end is reached.

The foundations of sociology—By EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1905. xiv+410 p. Price, $1.25 net.

The field of sociology is for many reasons one of the most attractive open to the student. It is a commonplace that we are what social forces have made us; and the endeavor to understand these forces is the modern way of yielding obedience to the oracular injunction, "Know thyself." If one is interested in the broader questions of social reform, he naturally turns to the scientific sociologist for light upon the perplexing problems that confront him. If his special interest centers in one of the so-called social sciences—ethics and economics, politics and jurisprudence, etc.—he will inevitably meet with problems that root in sociological facts, or that are of special significance for the sociologist alone. Accordingly a knowledge of sociology appears to be an essential part of general culture. When, however, one seeks to cross the frontiers of the sociological domain, he finds, to borrow Professor Ross's expression, "a little known territory, subject to the unreasonable and conflicting claims of rival chieftains." Mighty chieftains they are too, clad in grisly armor of polysyllabic phraseology. Order, however, is at last beginning to appear in this anarchic "Central Asia." The book under review indicates that the progressive elimination of fantastic views and the more systematic elaboration of the saner ones will in a measurable time give us a body of authoritative sociological theory from which all may gain profit. It also demonstrates that it is possible to write a book on sociology that any one may read with pleasure.

The foundations of sociology consists of a number of papers which had already found publication in periodical literature, most of them appearing in the *American journal of sociology*. The first chapter is a discussion of the scope of sociology; in the second the boundary between sociological science and its next of kin, economics, is drawn. Chapter III, entitled "Social laws," criticizes at some length the so-called social laws of the earlier sociologists, which were constructed after the analogy of the laws of other sciences, and contrasts them with the more recent sociological laws established on the basis of a faithful study of social facts. The fourth chapter, on the "Unit of sociological investigation," exposes the fallacy that lurks in the comparison and contrasting of vast complexes, like races, eras, and culture epochs. Scientific sociology must deal with simple phenomena that are capable of exact comparison, and that recur with sufficient frequency to justify scientific treatment. The fifth chapter, "Mob mind," displays to good effect the fruitfulness of this method. Chapter VI, on "The properties of group units," differentiates social groups and endeavors to show how the conduct of the individual is affected by the diverse group relations into which he enters. A chapter on "Social forces" combats the various dualistic interpretations of society and shows that social phenomena can be interpreted wholly in terms of desire; that it is thru the medium of desire that environment, for example, acts upon society. The eighth chapter, "The factors of social change," draws a distinction between the factors that resist change and those that have no inherent power to induce change, on the one hand, and the factors that naturally tend to modify existing social conditions, on the other hand. This distinction, which has recently been employed to good effect in economics, promises to be exceedingly fruitful in sociology; and the part of the chapter which is devoted to an analysis of the factors of change appears to the reviewer to be the most suggestive part of the work. Chapter IX, "Recent tendencies in sociology," is a critical review of a large mass of recent sociological literature, and as such will prove to be a convenient guide to one who wishes to acquaint himself in the briefest time with

an important development of modern thought. The last two chapters, on "The causes of race superiority" and "The value rank of the American people" (absurdly distorted into "The value of rank" in the running head), are sane and suggestive essays, dealing for the most part with problems which in the present state of knowledge are incapable of definite solution.

The foregoing meager summary will indicate that Professor Ross has covered a wide range of important topics. No brief review, however, can do justice to the masterly manner in which most of these topics have been handled. The science, as Professor Ross points out, has suffered from the fact that it has been built up largely by men who had exhausted their originality in other branches of knowledge, and who were therefore forced to employ an apparatus of investigation ill adapted to the needs of sociology. Hence the science is encumbered with a mass of worthless generalizations which must be demolished before real progress can be made. In this work of demolition Professor Ross has achieved notable results. There is a long list of so-called laws and principles that a reader of this book can never be deluded into accepting. The work is not, however, merely destructive. Scientific principles are substituted for the pseudo-principles that are cast aside.

Excellent as the book is, one receives the impression that it will hardly serve as the foundations of a science. It is rather a collection of carefully selected materials for such foundations. It is a peculiarity of the author's method to avoid definitions, as far as possible, and to make copious use of illustrations as a substitute. Thus we are given numerous examples of social facts but no clear statement of what it is that stamps a fact as social—for surely the author would not care to defend his statement that social facts are "all facts which we can not explain without bringing in the action of one human being on another" (p. 7). Impossible units of investigation are contrasted with better ones; but we are not told how to establish the best possible units for this science. The book, moreover, lacks the rigidity of outline and the systematic development that would characterize the true foundations of a science. It is not a system, or a part of a system.

But *The foundations of sociology* is something more than a scientific treatise. It is a piece of literature—and that it is good literature few would deny. Professor Ross writes an easy and picturesque style, which is itself an interesting problem in sociology, the key to which may be found in the chapter on "The value rank of the American people." It is the native expression of the winning sons of a winning people, to parody one of the author's pet phrases. And if Professor Ross admits to his vocabulary a few words not usually found in such good company, it is invariably because they best convey a meaning which we could not afford to leave unexprest.

Alvin S. Johnson

University of Nebraska

IX

NOTES AND NEWS

Limitations of Democracy

The Indian National Congress was opened on Wednesday, Mr. Naoroji delivering the presidential address. He took as the text of his discourse the following words from a speech delivered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman on November 23, 1905:—"Good government could never be a substitute for government by the people themselves." If that proposition is meant to apply to the Anglo-Saxon race and to the majority of the European nations, we accept it without demur. We would indeed amplify it, and say that good government can only be obtained in the cases we have named thru "government by the people themselves." If, however, the proposition is applied to the Asiatic races, or to races professing the Mohammedan faith or any of the native religions of India, then we must meet it with the most absolute and complete denial. In the case of the Oriental peoples good government and "government by the people themselves" are wholly antagonistic; or, to take our formula as a model, good government can never be obtained thru "government by the people themselves." Whether the Asiatic races are inferior intellectually or morally to the Anglo-Saxon or European races we do not propose to discuss. It is quite enough for us to know that they are politically inferior to, or, if you will, different from, the Anglo-Saxon races, and that this inferiority or difference, whichever it is, makes them incapable of obtaining good government, or anything which we Westerners mean by good government, if they are left to govern themselves. The proof of this proposition is written large in their records. We know in their broad outlines the histories of the Asiatic peoples for considerably more than two thousand years over a very wide

area and in a very large number of communities, but in no Asiatic case has self-government—that is, government of the people by the people for the people—ever succeeded. Indeed, it can hardly be said to have been tried among them, so contrary is it to the genius of the Asiatic nations. When those races have flourished, it has only been under some form of despotic and autocratic government. The people have not only never governed themselves, but have never even wanted to do so. They have wanted good government, no doubt—that is, they have wanted justice, and protection of life and property, and a certain measure of individual freedom—but they have never obtained it, or apparently, deemed it possible to obtain it, thru that representative democratic machinery the secret of which was discovered by the Anglo-Saxon race. Direct democracy is only possible in small communities like those of ancient Greece. Representative democracy, which alone is suitable to large free communities, and which has enabled democracy to borrow many of the advantages of oligarchy without losing its essential characteristic of popular sanction—*i. e.*, the prevalent will of the majority—has never appealed to the Asiatic mind. We would go further, and say that the fastidious individualism of the East instinctively rejects it. Whenever the East has desired to apply the democratic principle on its social side—and in a certain sense the East has always desired that—it has obtained its equality and fraternity thru a despotism like that of the Moguls, of the Emperors of China, or of the Sultans of Turkey,—a despotism which leaves only one head emerging above the level of the subjected crowd. There are neither ranks, nor degrees, nor privileges, nor prerogatives in a community where one man enjoys absolute and complete sovereignty, and where the rest are subject to his individual will. In the perfect submission and unconditional obedience which all men owe to the supreme ruler in the typical Oriental State there is a brotherhood of bondage which satisfies the Oriental desire for absolute equality.

Whenever Asian peoples have been, in their own opinion, governed well, they have been governed by a power which was just and intelligent and sympathetic, but which was

also absolute, and gave its orders because it believed them to be right and for the good of the governed, and not because the governed had chosen it and had the right to dismiss it if it displeased them. If, then, we are to continue to give India good government—and that, we take it, is the desire of all Englishmen whatever their particular shade of political opinion—we must give it her in the absolutist and autocratic form, and not thru any attempt to impose upon her our system of self-government. We say "impose upon her" advisedly, for if we were to yield to the demand of the Indian National Congress for self-government for India we should most certainly be imposing it upon the mass of the people. They know nothing and care less about the Congress and its doings, and were we to follow its advice and adopt its schemes, we should not be able to flatter ourselves with the notion that we were obeying the will of the people. It is as certain as anything human can be that if democratic self-government, including the meaning and method of national representative institutions, could be fully explained to that vast multitude which constitutes "the peoples of India," and a vote were then taken on the subject, they would reject it as unsuitable to their needs.—From the *Spectator* (London), December 29, 1906.

Limited Segregation

Principal Armstrong's article on "Limited segregation" in the December issue of the *School review* presents the reasons for and the results of an interesting experiment which is being made in the Englewood High School of Chicago.

"Limited segregation" is defined as separation of the sexes during the early years of adolescence for recitation purposes only.

The reasons given for this experiment are as follows:

1. Girls mature earlier than boys.

2. Girls outnumber boys in high schools in the ratio of four to one.

3. The greater number of the more mature, serious-minded

girls, tend to become weary and lose interest while waiting for their immature brothers to catch up.

4. Boys and girls have different goals in life.

5. Girls suffer from nervous breakdown because they must submit to the pressure necessary to secure satisfactory work from boys.

6. Satisfactory lessons in personal hygiene can not be given to mixed classes.

7. There are fundamental differences in the intellectual traits of boys and girls.

We must all grant at once that boys differ from girls—physically, mentally, and morally; we must also grant that different things should be emphasized in the training of boys and girls; we must also grant that certain school studies are primarily adapted to girls, altho of value to boys, *e. g.*, sewing and cooking. But having granted these differences we are by no means forced to the conclusion that in the matter of intellectual training (as well as in social training) boys and girls must be handled separately.

Principal Armstrong bases his experiment in limited segregation on what seem to the writer two wrong assumptions: First, that the line of demarcation between social and intellectual in school life is the division between recitation time and non-recitation time. No small part of the social training in the high school is gained in the recitation room, and the various school activities outside of the recitation certainly accomplish something in the way of intellectual training. Second, that in a coeducational school all boys and girls must pursue the same studies. It is certainly not true of any well equipped high school that all boys are compelled to take the same studies; much less is it true that girls must take exactly the same studies as the boys. The broad elective system in vogue in a majority of our schools makes it possible for all students to consult somewhat their natural likes and dislikes in forming their curriculum. In other words, in the modern large high school offering a wide range of electives in its program of studies a girl finds it possible to pursue those studies which do bear some relation to the problem of home-making. If, on

the other hand, she must plan for self-support by means of profession or business she also finds it possible to make fitting preparation. The modern high school alive to the importance of individual training provides the opportunities for separation in studies where necessary—in gymnasium, sewing, cooking, and personal hygiene.

But Principal Armstrong seems to be pleading for a masculine and feminine form of the traditional school studies. He asks, "Is a creature endowed by nature with marvelous intuitions to have these powers crippled by a course in higher mathematics or other forms of logic?" "Is imagination strengthened by a long course in mechanics?" "Is the inventive faculty to be quickened by rules of grammar?" "Is the genius for discovery and invention strengthened by herding boys in the graveyards of the past?"

These questions seem to imply that the girls' intellectual activities are limited to intuition and imagination, while the boy is given credit for the inventive and logical faculties and the genius for discovery. Is the boy to be given one kind of imaginative training and the girls another? Are we to have masculine and feminine language and scientific courses? Let us hope that such will not be the result of separation of the sexes in recitation hours; for altho there may be fundamental differences in intellectual traits of boys and girls, we still believe that girls can study mathematics and boys poetry with great profit.

The results of the Chicago experiment are given as follows:

1. A greater percentage of boys than of girls carry their foreign language work with success.

2. Boys' classes in mathematics excel both in numbers that pass and in higher marks.

3. All the boys prefer the separate classes; the girls are divided in their opinion.

4. Parents prefer separate classes.

Altho the results may seem meager, nevertheless, as all progress seems to be the result of experimentation, we should welcome the trial that is being made of the plan of limited segregation.

For High School Courses

LITERATURE

Tappan's **Short History of England's Literature**	$ .85
Tappan's **Short History of England's and America's Literature**	1.20
Simonds's **Student's History of English Literature**	1.25
Richardson's **Primer of American Literature**	.35
Higginson and Boynton's **History of American Literature**	1.25
Masterpieces of British Literature	1.00
College Requirements in English. For "Careful Study." One volume edition	1.00
Riverside Literature Series, including College Requirements. 1906–1911. Send for Catalogue. *151 nos.* 15 cents, paper, and 25 cents, cloth. *40 nos.* at prices from 30 cents, paper, to 75 cents, cloth.	
Rolfe's **Students' Series, 11** volumes, Scott, Tennyson, Byron, and Morris. (Send for catalogue) *net*	.53

COMPOSITION

Webster's Elementary Composition	.65
Webster's English: Composition and Literature	.90

Upon request we will mail to any address our Educational Catalogue and our Illustrated Educational Bulletin for January, 1907

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

A Few Complete Sets

Of the Educational Review from the first issue are left. The first thirty-two volumes (January, 1891 — December, 1906), unbound, will be sent on receipt of $140.00. Unbound volumes I, II, and XXI, $3.00 each; IV, V, VII, X, and XII, $7.00 each; XI, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, and XXXII, $1.50 each. Prices of back volumes subject to change without notice.

The Educational Review

Columbia University
New York, N. Y.

REMIT BY NEW YORK DRAFT, POSTAL OR EXPRESS ORDER

McMullen's Forty Lessons in Physics

By LYNN B. MCMULLEN, Shortridge High School, Indianapolis.
viii+452 pp. 12mo. $1.25, *net.*

From a review by W. A. Fiske of the Richmond (Ind.) High School in *School Science and Mathematics :*

"It is written by a high school man, one who knows the needs of the average high school pupil. It is not 'loaded' as extensively as many books designed for high school use, on which account it will leave the subject of physics clearer in the mind of the pupil than many others now on the market."

From a report on the book by W. R. Miller of the Boston English High School before the Eastern Association of Physics Teachers :

"Condensation seems to be the plan throughout, but condensation with all the life and interest left in.

"Definitions, as such, dry definitions, seldom appear. They are replaced by statements which give the pupil as much of the idea as he is capable of understanding and in a way that appeals to him at once. The first thing said about potential energy is this : 'Potential energy is the energy possessed by a body that will move and do work or acquire kinetic energy, if certain restraints are taken away.' Then follows an illustration. After this no formal definition is needed.

"The problems are excellent. As the author says in his preface : 'The numbers are made easy in order that the thought may be upon physical principles involved and that sight work may be encouraged.' These problems are, many of them, directly from life, and life is in them. In themselves they are 'mighty interesting reading,' for the pupil is to find out things about elevators, an electric car moving at a certain speed, the football field, steam yachts blown by the wind, an electric locomotive on the New York Central, the velocity of a bullet from one of the new Springfield rifles, the steamship Oceanic that displaces 26,000 tons, etc., etc."

From a review by C. J. France of the Baltimore City College in the *Maryland Educational Journal :*

"In place of the usual pictures of apparatus, we find diagrams so well chosen and planned that they can be readily understood by all. Any of them could be easily reproduced by a student who has no special training in drawing.

"Every right-hand page is left free for illustrations and supplementary material—diagrams, tables, and formulæ. As a result the latter stand out, as it were, in bas-relief. They are insistent on the attention and cannot escape being heeded. This is the most significant feature of the book and is a distinct contribution. Any teacher whose experience has taught him of the tendency of the pupil to regard the reading matter as of main importance and to slight an explanatory diagram, even of the simplest character, will feel the value of McMullen's methods."

Three Engineering Books

HOSKINS' TEXT-BOOK ON HYDRAULICS

By L. M. HOSKINS, Professor in Leland Stanford University. v+271 pp. 8vo. $2.50, *net.*

BENJAMIN'S MACHINE DESIGN

By CHARLES H. BENJAMIN, Professor in the Case School of Science. vii+202 pp. 12mo. $2.00, *net.*

LEFFLER'S ELASTIC ARCH

By BURTON R. LEFFLER, Engineer of Bridges of the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railway. viii+57 pp. 12mo. $1.00, *net.*

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY 29 W. 23d St. NEW YORK

Combination Bench and Tool Cabinet, with 95 Finest Quality Carpenter's Tools, $85.00, net

Special Tool Outfit Catalogue, No. 2084, describing above, and four other cabinets, upon request.

Hammacher, Schlemmer & Co.

Hardware, Tools and Supplies

NEW YORK SINCE 1848

4th Ave. and 13th St. (Block South of Union Square)

Educational Review

ANALYTICAL INDEX

TO

VOLUMES 1 to 25

January, 1891, to May, 1903

By

Charles Alexander Nelson

Head Reference Librarian, Columbia University Library

8vo. Cloth. $3.00. By mail, $3.12

"The fortunate libraries and individuals who possess complete sets of the REVIEW will be grateful for this work, which now transforms a row of bound volumes into a veritable encyclopædia of education, ready for consultation upon almost every imaginable modern educational problem. Analysis by topics is the leading feature of this index, and the work has been intelligently performed. The work is a dictionary catalogue (author and subject), extending to upwards of two hundred double-columned pages."—*The Dial*, Chicago, Ill.

Educational Review Publishing Company

Columbia University NEW YORK

ITALIAN BOOKS

OF EVERY DESCRIPTION

SCHOOL FICTION AND LITERATURE

AT MODERATE PRICES

CATALOGUE SENT UPON REQUEST

FRANCESCO TOCCI

520 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

The Discovery of Pike's Peak

The centennial of this discovery occurred in November. **Old South Leaflet, No. 174,** just added to the series, covers the most interesting portion of Pike's account of his explorations, originally published in 1810.

Price, 5 cents a copy $4 per 100

Send for catalogues

Directors of Old South Work

Old South Meeting House

WASHINGTON ST., BOSTON

LEMCKE & BUECHNER

General Booksellers and Importers

11 East 17th Street, New York

Branch Store: Columbia University Bookstore

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ALL American and Foreign Books, for the study of languages, etc., etc.

PUTZGER'S Historical Atlas, with German and English Text, $1.25; mailing price, $1.40.

FLUEGEL-SCHMIDT-TANGER'S German and English Dictionary, 2 vols., $5.20.

Superior Professors, Teachers, Tutors, Governesses and Specialists, in every Department of Instruction, supplied to Colleges, Schools and Families. Call on or address

MRS. M. J. YOUNG-FULTON.

American and Foreign Teachers' Agency, 23 Union Square, New York City.

Columbia University

In the City of New York

The University includes the following:

Columbia College, founded in 1754, and **Barnard College**, founded in 1889, offering to men and women, respectively, programs of study which may be begun either in September or February and leading normally in from three to four years to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science. The program of study in Columbia College makes it possible for a well-qualified student to satisfy the requirements for both the bachelor's degree in arts or science and a professional degree in law, medicine, technology, or education in six, five and a half, or five years as the case may be.

The Faculties of **Political Science, Philosophy** and **Pure Science**, offering advanced programs of study and investigation leading to the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy.

The professional schools of

Law—established in 1858, offering courses of three years leading to the degree of Bachelor of Laws

Medicine—the College of Physicians and Surgeons—established in 1807, offering four-year courses leading to the degree of Doctor of Medicine

Mines—founded in 1863, offering courses of four years leading to degrees in Mining Engineering and in Metallurgy

Chemistry and Engineering—set apart from School of Mines in 1896, offering four-year courses leading to degrees in Chemistry and in Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, and Chemical Engineering

Teachers College—founded in 1888, offering programs of study each of two years based upon two years of collegiate work and leading to professional diplomas and degrees in elementary or secondary teaching or some branch thereof, and advanced programs leading to the Master's and Doctor's diplomas in Education

Fine Arts—offering programs of indeterminate length leading to certificates and degrees in Architecture and Music, and to a certificate in Design

Pharmacy—the New York College of Pharmacy—founded in 1831, offering courses of two and three years leading to appropriate certificates and degrees

In the **Summer Session** the University offers courses giving both general and professional training which may be taken either with or without regard to an academic degree or diploma.

Through its system of **Extension Teaching** the University offers many courses of study to persons unable otherwise to receive academic training.

There are **Residence Halls** with accommodations for five hundred men and three hundred and fifty women.

The price of the University Catalogue is twenty-five cents postpaid. Detailed information regarding the work in any department will be furnished without charge upon application to the *Secretary of Columbia University*, New York, N. Y.

For Teachers of any subject who can also coach athletic teams, or specialists n Physical Training and Athletics, write us. Instructors wanted for best schools nd universities; $600 to $3000 yearly.

PHYSICAL TRAINING TEACHERS' BUREAU, 212 S. SECOND ST., ROCKFORD, ILL.

EIMER & AMEND

205-211 Third Ave., New York

Manufacturers and Importers of

Chemicals, Chemical Apparatus, Physical Apparatus, Scientific Instruments

Everything needed in the Laboratory. Glass Blowing done on the premises. Metalware Manufacturing Department n the House.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

SUMMER SESSION

June 17 to August 16, 1907

Large Faculty. More than 100 courses. Better facilities than ever before. Tuition, $12. A free scholarship to every high school teacher in Illinois, and to all other teachers who can matriculate in the University. For further information address

THOMAS ARKLE CLARK, Director
Urbana, Illinois

Intercollegiate Bureau of Academic Costume.

Cotrell & Leonard

Albany, New York

Makers of the

Caps, Gowns, and Hoods

to COLUMBIA and the other Colleges. Illustrated bulletin, samples, etc., upon request.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Summer Session, 1907

Tuesday, July 9, to Saturday, August 17

145 courses are offered, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year and leading to the degrees of A. B., B. S., A. M., and the various diplomas in Teachers College. Special attention is given to Education, including Domestic Science, Geography, Kindergarten, Manual Training, and Nature Study; to the sciences—Civil Engineering, Chemistry, Geology, Mechanical Engineering, Physics, and Physiology; to the languages—English, French, German, Greek, Italian, Latin, and Spanish. Physical Education is given in 9 courses. The following subjects are also offered: Drawing, Economics, Fine Arts, History, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, and Psychology.

All of these courses are open to properly qualified students without entrance examinations.

Public lectures, concerts, and excursions add to the value and attractiveness of the Summer Session.

Inexpensive living offered at the Residence Halls (Livingston for men, Whittier for women).

Reduced railroad rates are offered to students of the Summer Session.

The Announcement may be obtained upon application to the Secretary, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

TO OUR READERS

WE WANT THE NAMES of men and women to whom we may introduce THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW. Below are spaces for ten names.

Fill out the blank with the names and addresses of your friends, libraries or institutions, not already subscribers, who would appreciate THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW and its work for education, and mail it to us. We shall immediately send them sample copies.

For a complete list of ten names and seventy-five cents, we will send you any one of the volumes of the Great Educators Series, advertised on the opposite page. Address

THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

P. O. Sub-Station 84, New York, N. Y.

NAMES	ADDRESSES

The Great Educators

These 11 volumes, making the BEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION in existence, may be had at a reduced price, together with one year's subscription to the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, FOR NOTHING, if both are ordered together.

If ordered separately,

Great Educators Series, 11 volumes, $11.25
EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, one year, 3.00

Total, $14.25 or

If ordered together,

$10.50 in one payment or
$11.00 in instalments of $1 monthly, after an initial payment of $3.00

An illustrated circular of the Great Educators Series, edited by President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, and published by Charles Scribner's Sons, will be sent free on application.

Aristotle and the Ancient Educational Ideals. By Thomas Davidson, M. A., LL. D.

Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools. By Professor Andrew F. West of Princeton University.

Abelard and the Origin of the Universities. By Jules Gabriel Compayré, Rector of the University of Lyons, France.

Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits. By Thomas Hughes, S. J.

Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform. By Professor W. S. Monroe of the State Normal School, Westfield, Mass.

Rousseau and Education according to Nature. By Thomas Davidson, M. A., LL. D.

Pestalozzi and the Modern Elementary School. By A. Pinloche, Professor in the Lycée Charlemagne, Paris, France.

Froebel and Education through Self-Activity. By H. Courthope Bowen, M. A., late Lecturer in the University of Cambridge.

Herbart and the Herbartians. By Charles De Garmo, Ph. D., Professor of Education in Cornell University.

Thomas and Matthew Arnold and Their Influence on English Education. By Sir Joshua Fitch, LL. D., late Inspector of Training Colleges in England.

Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States. By B. A. Hinsdale, Ph. D., LL. D., Professor of the Science and Art of Teaching in the University of Michigan.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

P. O. Sub-Station 84, New York

Please send by prepaid express the Great Educators Series, 11 volumes, and enter my name as a subscriber to the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW for one year, for which I promise to pay { $10.50 / $11.00

Name _____

Address _____

Date _____

Educational Review

Edited by NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

"We find the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW absolutely indispensable at every turn."—*Michael E. Sadler, Director of Special Enquiries and Reports, Board of Education, London, England, September 13, 1901.*

"I wish I could tell you how much of stimulus and inspiration I get from reading the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW. The educational world can never repay you for the work you have put into that richly stored magazine. I have just gone through the entire twenty-one volumes in order to get some things that I especially desired, and I am simply amazed at what I find in those volumes."—*Wilbur P. Gordy, High School, Hartford, Conn., September, 1901.*

"I find that I cannot do without it."—*Andrew W. Edson, Department of Education, New York City.*

"The EDUCATIONAL REVIEW gains in strength monthly. I value the work as highly as any educational work I have among some thousand books."—*Fred W. Atkinson, formerly Superintendent of Public Instruction, Manila, Philippine Islands.*

"It is difficult to see how the EDUCATIONAL REVIEW could be made more essential for us teachers and executives."—*President Charles F. Thwing, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.*

"I have been a subscriber to the REVIEW since it started, and hope to continue—well, not until it ends, but until I go out of education and teaching."—*Will S. Monroe, State Normal School, Westfield, Mass.*

"The broadest and most able of the American periodicals devoted to education."—*New York Times.*

"An educational magazine of which the teaching profession may well be proud. There is nothing better in educational journalism in any country. And it has an editor who has convictions, and the courage of them."—*School and Home Education, Bloomington, Ill.*

"The REVIEW has from the first issue taken its place at the head of American periodicals devoted to education. It is, indeed, the first educational paper in America to win for our country the respect of educationalists abroad."—*Journal of Pedagogy, Ypsilanti, Mich.*

$3.00 (14s. 6d.) a year, 35 cents (1s. 8d.) a Copy. Ten Numbers, none being issued for July and August. Trial Subscription (for new subscribers only), Three Months, Fifty Cents.

Educational Review Publishing Co. NEW YORK